

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. VII.

APRIL 1903.

No. 2.

CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY.

(Continued.)

III. PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The pentecostal firstfruits of New Testament Christianity were not gathered in the streets of Jerusalem by a band of Salvationists, but in a meeting of the disciples who *were all with one accord in one place*,¹⁾ sitting in a house,²⁾ probably one of the thirty halls connected with the temple. We know that the 120 who formed the nucleus of this first Christian congregation, men and women, had been accustomed to meet for prayer and supplication.³⁾ At this pentecostal meeting, the *wonderful works of God*⁴⁾ were proclaimed, and Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and preached the gospel of Christ crucified and glorified.⁵⁾ There were those who *gladly received his word*,⁶⁾ which could not have been known to the apostles but by a profession of faith, which the new converts made before they *were baptized*.⁷⁾

Here, then, we have the various acts performed in the first meeting of the first congregation of primitive Christianity: the preaching of the word, the administration of a sacrament, confession of faith and prayer. Nor was this

1) Acts 2, 1.

2) Acts 2, 2.

3) Acts 1, 14.

4) Acts 2, 11.

5) Acts 2, 14 ff.

6) Acts 2, 41.

7) Acts 2, 41.

first assembly the last; the meeting of the congregation was an institution of the primitive church. And as we find the congregations assembled, we find them similarly occupied as was the pentecostal church.

a. THE MEETINGS OF THE CONGREGATION.

The very name by which Christ and the apostles chose to designate the church, ἐκκλησία, the Hebrew קְבָד, was by an *usus loquendi* of the Septuagint the familiar term for the assemblies of God's people for religious purposes.¹⁾ In this sense it is also employed to denote the meetings of Christian congregations when Paul says, συνέρχεσθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.²⁾ Regular religious meetings were of traditional standing among the Jews. They were held every Sabbath in the synagogues,³⁾ of which there were 480 in Jerusalem alone. And not only there. It was a rule that in every place where there were ten Jews who could meet, a synagogue should be built; and hence *Moses had in every city them that preached him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.*⁴⁾ Thus we find Paul in the synagogue, and people gathered about him, at Pisidian Antioch,⁵⁾ at Iconium,⁶⁾ at Ephesus,⁷⁾ and also in Europe, at Thessalonica,⁸⁾ at Corinth.⁹⁾ In these meetings of Jews and proselytes the gospel was preached, and those who believed continued to meet, though they were driven from the synagogue and had to assemble at another meeting place. Thus at Ephesus, Paul separated the disciples and repaired to another place, the σχολή of one Tyranus,¹⁰⁾ who was either a public teacher who had a lecture room of his own, or the landlord who owned the house and leased it to individuals or societies for school purposes, very

1) Cf. Deut. 31, 30. Josh. 8, 35. Acts 7, 38. Hebr. 2, 12.

2) 1 Cor. 11, 18; cf. 1 Cor. 14, 19. 34. 35.

3) Mark 1, 21. Luke 4, 15. 16. 20. 28. 38. 44; 13, 10. Acts 13, 1.

4) Acts 15, 21. 5) Acts 13, 14. 6) Acts 14, 1.

7) Acts 19, 8. 8) Acts 17, 1. 9) Acts 18, 4.

10) Acts 19, 9.

much as halls are rented in our day and many an American congregation has worshiped in a rented hall for years.

At Jerusalem the number of disciples was so great, three thousand,¹⁾ five thousand,²⁾ and more,³⁾ that it was impossible for them to assemble in one house for the exercise of public worship. The apostles and the church had a mission to fulfill toward the masses, and they began by daily preaching in the temple,⁴⁾ where they spoke to the multitudes *in Solomon's porch*⁵⁾ and performed many miracles.⁶⁾ These temple meetings were probably discontinued when the dispersion led the apostles to understand that the beginning of which the Lord had spoken⁷⁾ had now been accomplished at Jerusalem. But these occasions for casting the net among the multitudes of the great city and its environs and the neighboring towns⁸⁾ were not the only gatherings of the disciples where the word was preached. We read that *daily in the temple and in every house, κατ' οἶκον, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.*⁹⁾ We leave it an open question what *κατ' οἶκον* here says, whether it refers to the private ministration of the ministers in the families of the church, or whether these houses were the dwellings of disciples who had thrown open their homes and devoted a room or adjoining rooms to the purpose of common worship for themselves and their Christian neighbors. But we read that Peter and John, when they had been dismissed by the Jewish court, *went to their own company, πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους,*¹⁰⁾ who were *assembled together in a certain place, τόπος,*¹¹⁾ where they prayed and praised the Lord and spake the word with boldness and heard the report of Peter and John.¹²⁾ This was clearly a meeting of disciples among themselves at some house where Peter and John, who had

1) Acts 2, 41.

2) Acts 4, 4.

3) Acts 5, 14; 6, 7.

4) Acts 2, 46; 3, 1. 8; 4, 1. 2; 5, 20. 21. 25. 42.

5) Acts 5, 12; cf. 3, 11.

6) Ibid.

7) Luke 24, 47.

8) Acts 5, 16.

9) Acts 5, 42; cf. Acts 20, 20.

10) Acts 4, 23.

11) Acts 4, 31.

12) Acts 4, 23—31.

been in prison over night, were sure to find them assembled. On another occasion, also coming from prison, Peter went straightway to the house of Mary, *where many were gathered together praying.*¹⁾ This was certainly an ἐκκλησία in Mary's house, not a gathering of her family. Thus also Paul sends greetings to Aquila and Priscilla at Rome and *the church at their house*, καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν.²⁾ Again, he transmits greetings, as from *the churches of Asia*, so from Aquila and Priscilla *with the church in their house*, σὺν τῇ κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ.³⁾ In the epistle to Philemon Paul and Timothy greet Philemon, sister Appia, probably Philemon's wife, Archippus, if not a son, probably another inmate of the house, and adds, καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ,⁴⁾ which clearly refers to persons not already named. In the neighboring Laodicea, about nine miles away, a man, Nymphas, or a woman, Nympha,—the reading is doubtful—is particularly greeted, as distinct from *the brethren*, and with him or her ἡ κατ' οἶκον αὐτοῦ (αὐτῆς) ἐκκλησία,⁵⁾ whence it has been surmised that there was a small suburban or rural congregation connected with the church at Laodicea, which met at the house of Nymphas or Nympha. In all these instances, the expression is the same, ἡ κατ' οἶκόν τινος ἐκκλησία, indicating that the thing denoted was the same and known as such to the readers, not the family in (*ἐν*) his house, but, just as we would say in English, *the meeting at his house*. This interpretation abides by a well established meaning of ἐκκλησία and fits well into the circumstances of the primitive churches then and now. Our pioneer and itinerant preachers have laid the foundations of many a congregation in the front room of private houses, and these are not times of persecution as those of primitive Christianity were, when Jews and Gentiles alike forced the disciples to go into hiding, as they who *were gathered together praying in the house of Mary* were assembled behind doors secured against intruders, and

1) Acts 12, 12.

2) Rom. 16, 5.

3) 1 Cor. 16, 19.

4) Philem. 1, 2.

5) Col. 4, 15.

only cautiously opened,¹⁾ or to follow the Lord's direction, *When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another.*²⁾ At Corinth Paul preached in a private house, the house of one Justus,³⁾ after he had abandoned the synagogue, and at Rome he made his *hired house* a meeting house in which he *preached the kingdom of God.*⁴⁾ There is not even a uniform tradition as to the earliest church in Rome. A manuscript of the Liber Pontificalis assigns the oldest of the Roman churches, S. Pudentiana, to Pius I, about A. D. 143, and tradition claims that it was erected over the house of the senator Pudens, who is said to have been the host of St. Peter. This would, if it were history and not legend, again lead up to an original *χατ' οἰχον ἐκκλησία*.

While the great upheaval in Jerusalem subsequent to the garnering of the firstfruits lasted, the apostles were before the people daily, *πᾶσαν ἡμέραν.*⁵⁾ Thus, also, Paul disputed daily in the school of Tyrannus for two years.⁶⁾ Where the apostles sought the ear of Jewish hearers, they availed themselves of the opportunities afforded by the custom of the Jews to meet in the synagogues on the Sabbath day.⁷⁾ But where the disciples were assembled among themselves, *the first day of the week*⁸⁾ came to be the regular meeting day. This was the Lord's day,⁹⁾ the day of his resurrection,¹⁰⁾ the day of the pentecostal firstfruits, the day which had spontaneously recommended itself to the disciples as a day of joyful commemoration.¹¹⁾ This was the *status dies* on which, as Pliny reports to his emperor Trajan, the Christians in Bithynia-Pontus were accustomed to meet at the beginning of the second century.¹²⁾ We do not hear that this day was at any time set apart by a decree of any

1) Acts 12, 12 ff.

2) Matt. 10, 23; cf. Acts 8, 1 ff.

3) Acts 18, 7.

4) Acts 28, 30 f.

5) Acts 2, 46; 5, 42.

6) Acts 19, 9 f.

7) Acts 13, 14. 44; 16, 13; 18, 4.

8) Acts 20, 7. 1 Cor. 16, 2.

9) Rev. 1, 10.

10) Matt. 28, 1. Mark 16, 1. Luke 24, 1. John 20, 1. 19.

11) John 20, 26.

12) Plinii epp. X, 97.

church or council of churches or their representatives. It appears that for a time there were those in some of the early churches who considered the observance of certain days and seasons a matter of conscience and duty.¹⁾ But their notions were not permitted to prevail.²⁾ On the other hand, when separatistic or pietistic tendencies led some to withdraw or keep aloof from the meetings of the congregation, they were reprimanded, not because of a disregard of the day, but for neglecting their spiritual wants.³⁾ That a Christian should attend public worship was looked upon as a matter of course.⁴⁾ At the same time, the meetings of the congregation were not closed to those who were not yet of the unity of faith, but were open also to unbelievers.⁵⁾ There was no *disciplina arcani* in the primitive church. Also what little we may know concerning the hours of worship cannot establish the assumption of esoteric exercises in the earliest church, at which only those initiated to full discipleship had been permitted to be in attendance. The ninth hour, about three o'clock in the afternoon, was a Jewish hour of prayer, at which Peter and John were sure to find people in and about the temple.⁶⁾ The nightly meeting in the house of Mary⁷⁾ may have been a special gathering during a time of special distress, for the purpose of making intercession for Peter's delivery.⁸⁾ But the occasion on which Paul bade farewell to the brethren at Troas was evidently the regular Sunday evening meeting of the congregation, though exceptionally protracted to a late hour because of the apostle's presence and impending departure.⁹⁾ And Pliny's report speaks of two meetings held on the *status dies*, one *ante lucem*, before daybreak, the other, a second meeting after the disbanding of the first, at an hour which

1) Gal. 4, 10. Rom. 14, 5.

2) Gal. 4, 11. Col. 2, 16.

3) Hebr. 10, 23—25.

4) Eph. 4, 11 ff.

5) 1 Cor. 14, 23 f.

6) Acts 3, 1; 4, 3.

7) Acts 12, 12; cf. v. 6.

8) Acts 12, 5.

9) Acts 20, 7—11.

is not indicated by the words, *morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi*,¹⁾ i. e., "it had been their custom to disband and to meet once more." What was transacted in these meetings will occupy us in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

b. THE WORD.

In every Jewish synagogue there was a sacred chest containing a copy of Moses and the Prophets, from which texts were read and expounded before the congregation. Thus Jesus, *as his custom was, went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read the customary lesson. And there was delivered to him, from the case in which it was kept, the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," etc. And when he had read the lesson, he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down.* For the rabbi spoke from his seat, as the Christian bishops did in later days. *And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him in expectation of his sermon on the text he had read. And he began to say unto them, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. . . . Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself," etc.²⁾* Here we have a description of a familiar occurrence in the manner of Luke, the "historian" among the holy writers of the New Testament. In like manner Jesus taught on the Sabbath day in the synagogue at Capernaum,³⁾ and in other synagogues,⁴⁾ and Moses and the prophets were read every Sabbath day in the synagogues.⁵⁾ Thus the reading of Scripture lessons and teaching by way of expounding the text read from the book were public religious exercises familiar to the Jews and proselytes the world over. It was,

1) Plinii *epp. X*, 97.

2) Luke 4, 16–27.

3) Luke 4, 31. Mark 1, 21 f.

4) John 18, 20. Luke 13, 10.

5) Acts 15, 21; 13, 27. 2 Cor. 3, 14. 15.

therefore, no innovation that, when the disciples began to meet among themselves, they sought and found edification by way of having the Scriptures read to them and being taught according to the Scriptures. Thus St. Paul preached the gospel to his hearers at Corinth, delivering to them what he also had received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.*¹⁾ From the very beginning the disciples at Jerusalem *continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine,*²⁾ and the apostles *ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.*³⁾ Paul likewise reminds the elders of Ephesus how he had *taught* publicly and from house to house.⁴⁾ And not only the spoken word of the apostles, but also their written word was heard in the churches of apostolic days. When St. Paul charges the Thessalonians that his *epistle be read unto all the holy brethren,*⁵⁾ ἀναγνωσθῆναι here, as elsewhere,⁶⁾ means being read aloud to others, *Vorlesen.* Of his epistle to the Colossians he writes that when it should have been read among them, he would have them cause it to be *read also ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ, in the church of the Laodiceans.*⁷⁾ And when the writer of the Apocalypse says, *Blessed is HE that readeth, and THEY that hear the words of this prophecy,*⁸⁾ he evidently has in mind the public reading of the book in the assemblies of the churches in Asia, where *one* should read and *many* should hear.

The public administration of the *word* was looked upon as an official function of those who were in charge of the *ministry of the word*, διαχονία τοῦ λόγου.⁹⁾ The edification of the church was the work of the ministry, ἔργον διαχονίας, allotted to the apostles and prophets and evangelists and pastors and teachers.¹⁰⁾ Not all the disciples, not even all the functionaries of the church, were *teachers.*¹¹⁾ The προΐστα-

1) 1 Cor. 15, 1—4.

2) Acts 2, 42.

3) Acts 5, 42.

4) Acts 20, 20.

5) 1 Thess. 5, 27.

6) Luke 4, 16. Acts 13, 27; 15, 21. 2 Cor. 3, 15. Col. 4, 16.

7) Col. 4, 16.

8) Rev. 1, 3.

9) Acts 6, 4; cf. v. 2.

10) Eph. 4, 11 f.

11) 1 Cor. 12, 28 f.

μενοι, who presided over the churches, were also their *νουθετοῦντες*, who admonished them.¹⁾ The *ηγούμενοι*,²⁾ the leaders, who were at the head of the churches, the bishops or elders, were they who spoke, *ἐλάλησαν, to them the word of God*.³⁾

At Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, the wonderful works of God were proclaimed in many tongues, the native languages of the strangers from many lands.⁴⁾ Being filled with the Holy Ghost, the disciples spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance.⁵⁾ This miraculous gift was also bestowed upon others. We hear that in the house of Cornelius, *the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word*,⁶⁾ and that, as the gift of the Holy Ghost was poured out on them, they were heard to speak with tongues and magnify God.⁷⁾ Of the disciples at Ephesus we learn that *when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied*.⁸⁾ Here we have two manifestations of the Spirit, speaking with tongues and prophecy, which are also distinguished, and are placed in a line with other gifts of the Spirit, in Paul's admonition to the church at Corinth concerning the diversities of gifts and operations and their proper uses⁹⁾ for the edification of the church.¹⁰⁾ The precise nature of some of these gifts may be a matter of dispute in our day, since the gifts themselves are no longer among the manifestations of the Spirit as they were in the primitive church. But what we learn concerning the use of these gifts must not be misconstrued into the unhistorical notion of a general license to teach in the church. Paul expressly and emphatically states that, there being diversities of gifts¹¹⁾ and diversities of operations,¹²⁾ not all were teachers, just as not all were apostles or prophets or workers of miracles.¹³⁾ Aptness to teach was

1) 1 Thess. 5, 12.

2) Hebr. 13, 7. 17. 24.

3) Hebr. 13, 7.

4) Acts 2, 4—11.

5) Acts 2, 4.

6) Acts 10, 44.

7) Acts 10, 45. 46.

8) Acts 19, 6.

9) 1 Cor. 12, 4 ff. 10. 28; 14, 4. 5. 22. 39. al.

10) 1 Cor. 14, 12. 26.

11) 1 Cor. 12, 4.

12) 1 Cor. 12, 6.

13) 1 Cor. 12, 29.

among the particular qualifications for the pastoral office,¹⁾ and when Paul says, *τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*,²⁾ he says that *pastors and teachers* were the same persons. Again, the gift of prophecy was also bestowed upon women; the four daughters of Philip the evangelist prophesied;³⁾ but women were not permitted to speak, to teach, in the church.⁴⁾ Not that they were considered of inferior intelligence and knowledge of spiritual things; for we hear that there were those among them who prophesied; but it was considered a shame for women to speak in the church,⁵⁾ as unbecoming to their station and out of keeping with their proper relation to the men.⁶⁾

c. THE SACRAMENTS.

Baptism.

Of the converts who joined the 120 disciples on the day of Pentecost we learn that they were *baptized*, and when Luke continues, *and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls*,⁷⁾ and thus closes the record of that day, we are led to understand that the baptism of the 3000 took place in connection with the events recorded. Baptism was considered a means of grace, giving remission of sins,⁸⁾ and a rite whereby those who received it were formally added to the church of Christ, admitted to acknowledged discipleship.⁹⁾ We are all baptized into one body, *εἰς ἐν σῶμα*, says Paul.¹⁰⁾ The unity of baptism was to be a token of the unity of faith.¹¹⁾ Thus the Ethiopian eunuch,¹²⁾ Saul of Tarsus,¹³⁾ Cornelius and his kinsmen,¹⁴⁾ Lydia and her household,¹⁵⁾ the prison keeper of Philippi and all his,¹⁶⁾ the numerous Corinthian converts,¹⁷⁾ were baptized immediately upon their conversion to

1) 1 Tim. 3, 2. 2 Tim. 2, 24. Tit. 1, 9. 2) Eph. 4, 11.

3) Acts 21, 9. 4) 1 Cor. 14, 34. 1 Tim. 2, 11 f.

5) 1 Cor. 14, 35. 6) Ibid. 1 Tim. 2, 11—14. 7) Acts 2, 41.

8) Acts 2, 38. 9) Acts 2, 41. 10) 1 Cor. 12, 13.

11) Eph. 4, 4. 5. 12) Acts 8, 36 ff. 13) Acts 9, 18; 22, 16.

14) Acts 10, 47 f. 15) Acts 16, 15. 16) Acts 16, 33.

17) Acts 18, 8.

Christ. In all these instances the sacrament was administered in close connection with the preaching of the word and, as a rule, by the same persons who preached the word. When we are told that they who received the word,¹⁾ who hearing believed,²⁾ were baptized, these statements imply that profession of faith was made before baptism, since faith was then as it is now in the heart and mind of men and must be uttered to be known to others. In the case of the eunuch the narrative explicitly dwells on this point; for we hear that when the eunuch had expressed his desire to be baptized, Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." . . . And he baptized him.³⁾ Where, as in several of the instances enumerated above, entire families were baptized, we do not hear children excepted; neither where Paul says that he baptized the household of Stephanas.⁴⁾

As to the mode of baptism, the manner of applying the sacramental water, not a single case can be quoted where, in the primitive church, Christian baptism was performed by immersion. When the three thousand were baptized in one day, the day of Pentecost, where was the river or pool in or near Jerusalem in which 3000 persons might have been immersed, even if the magistrates had permitted such use of public reservoirs to these followers of the Nazarene whom they had but lately condemned to death and delivered up to be crucified? When Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends magnified God, Peter said, *Can any man forbid water, μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ δύναται κωλῦσαι τις, that these should not be baptized?*⁵⁾ *Κωλύειν* is to keep away, to prevent from coming near. Peter's question is not, whether any one can keep these people from going near the water, but whether any one can keep the water from being brought near these

1) Acts 2, 41.

2) Acts 18, 8.

3) Acts 8, 37 f.

4) 1 Cor. 1, 16.

5) Acts 10, 47.

people, and the rhetorical question is evidently the more emphatical form of ordering water to be brought without delay, that these Gentiles might be baptized where they were, not by immersion, but by aspersion or affusion. Again, the eunuch was on his way through a desert country, where water was then and is now scanty, the water-courses being few and low in their beds. That Philip and the eunuch *went down into the water*, *κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*,¹⁾ and, after the baptism, *came up out of the water*, *ἀνέβησαν ἐξ τοῦ ὕδατος*,²⁾ is so far from establishing a case of immersion, that it rather appears the simplest way in which the two might get into position to permit Philip to lift water with his hand from a shallow brook or pool to pour it upon the eunuch's head. This would apply, even if in this case the immersion of a grown person had not, because of the scantiness of water, been impossible, but also if the "water" had been the sea in which Pharaoh was drowned with all his host. Besides, the apostles and evangelists, in speaking of this sacramental act, employ the verb *βαπτίζειν*, and the nouns *βάπτισμα* and *βαπτισμός*. But in all these books written in the days of the primitive church and, primarily, to churches or individuals of earliest Christianity, the verb *βαπτίζειν* and its derivatives, occurring 122 times, are not in a single instance used in a general sense, so that they might be translated by *immerse*, but always and without a single exception for ritual or religious acts, either Jewish or Christian. The Jewish rites which these words denote were largely performed by sprinkling or pouring, according to the ritual law,³⁾ and a word employed to designate these ritual acts, when applied to the New Testament rite, would naturally suggest an act, not of immersion, but of sprinkling or pouring the sacramental water upon the person being *baptized*.

1) Acts 8, 38.

2) Acts 8, 39.

3) Hebr. 9, 10. Mark 7, 4. Luke 11, 38 f.; cf. Numb. 19, 14—19; 8, 7.

The Lord's supper.

That Jesus intended to institute an ordinance which should remain in the church cannot be reasonably doubted in the face of the words, *This do in remembrance of me*, and, *This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.*¹⁾ To remember is to recall to the mind what is no longer present to the senses. Remembrance of things present belongs to the future. So Jesus, being yet present where his disciples could see him, looked forward to the time when he would have departed and they should not see him.²⁾ And then they were to remember him, and in remembrance of him they were to do what was now being enacted. It was his will that in future assemblies of his disciples the sacramental bread should be distributed and the cup of blessing should be given in remembrance of him. This was what St. Paul, too, had received of the Lord³⁾ to deliver it to the churches, and in accordance therewith the members of the churches ate this bread and drank this cup and in so doing showed the Lord's death.⁴⁾ This was *the Lord's supper*,⁵⁾ at which the guests partook of *the Lord's table*⁶⁾ and of *that one bread*⁷⁾ and of the *cup of the Lord*.⁸⁾ The elements used in the sacrament were *bread*⁹⁾ and the contents of the cup of blessing, the cup of the Lord, which contained *the fruit of the vine*.¹⁰⁾ This was not unfermented juice of the grape, which was never used at the Passover; and we learn from St. Paul that the wine used in the meetings of the apostolic churches and at the Lord's supper was fermented wine, which, if taken to excess, would intoxicate.¹¹⁾ These elements were *consecrated* and *distributed* by the celebrants, as Paul says, *The cup of blessing which we bless, δι εὐλογοῦμεν, and the bread which we break, δι κλάσματος.*¹²⁾ And this

1) 1 Cor. 11, 24. Luke 22, 19.

2) John 16, 16—19.

3) 1 Cor. 11, 23 ff.

4) 1 Cor. 11, 26.

5) 1 Cor. 11, 20.

6) 1 Cor. 10, 21.

7) 1 Cor. 10, 17; 11, 26—28.

8) 1 Cor. 10, 21; 11, 28.

9) 1 Cor. 10, 16. 17; 11, 26—28.

10) Matt. 26, 29. Mark 14, 25. Luke 22, 18.

11) 1 Cor. 11, 21.

12) 1 Cor. 10, 16.

was done in the meetings of the church, *when they came together.*¹⁾ Of the disciples at Jerusalem St. Luke says, *They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and [the] fellowship, and in [the] breaking of [the] bread, and in [the] prayers.* The definite articles in the Greek text, which are neglected in the Authorized Version, should not be disregarded. They indicate that the words before which they stand denote certain definite concepts, familiar to the reader in their definiteness, and *ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* is not breaking of bread in general, but the breaking of the bread which was of a kind with the teaching of the apostles and the prayers in which the disciples continued stedfastly, a religious act of regular occurrence and recurrence in which they joined as a religious community. *The breaking of the bread* would, thus, seem to have been the distribution of the sacramental bread, *ὁ ἄρτος δὲ κλαῖμα*,²⁾ the celebration of the Lord's supper in the meetings in which the preaching of the word and the prayers of the saints were concomitant exercises.

The words, *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,*³⁾ were addressed to a Christian church. The communicants at the Lord's table were members of the church. Here no distinction is made between men and women; all were to receive the sacrament, the whole sacrament, not only the bread, but also the cup,⁴⁾ provided that they were able to examine themselves as to their worthiness.⁵⁾ The limit of admission was thus fixed so as to bar from the Lord's table all those who were not yet or no longer members of the orthodox church, and those within the church who were not yet in years of discretion.

In close connection with the celebration of the eucharist we find what became known as the *agapae*. These fraternal feasts of love were included in the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* which was exercised *κατ' οἶκον* in the primitive church, daily at

1) 1 Cor. 11, 20.

2) 1 Cor. 10, 16.

3) 1 Cor. 11, 26.

4) Cf. 1 Cor. 11, 27—29.

5) 1 Cor. 11, 28.

first¹⁾ and in the Sunday evening services,²⁾ after the sermon,³⁾ later on. The *agape* was not an integral part of what the Lord had enjoined upon his disciples, saying, *This do in remembrance of me*, but a free commemoration of the paschal supper at the end of which Jesus had instituted the sacrament. From the meat and drink furnished for the love-feast by the brethren, perhaps the wealthier among them, the bread and wine for the eucharist were probably taken. But we hear that certain abuses attached themselves here and there to this free institution of the early church. What was intended for a simple meal terminating in the eucharist became an occasion of excessive eating and drinking on the part of some, who gorged themselves with the viands they had brought, while their poorer brethren came and went hungry.⁴⁾ Thus what assumed the fair name of *agape*,⁵⁾ *love*, resulted in a painful violation of true love and in damage to the church, so that the members *came together not for the better, but for the worse*.⁶⁾ Besides, as such excesses and offenses immediately preceded the sacred act of communion, there was great danger to many of eating and drinking unworthily.⁷⁾ Similar abuses associated with the *agapae* are mentioned by St. Jude, saying, *These are spots, σπιλάδες, cliffs, in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear*.⁸⁾ He speaks of certain men who had *crept in unawares*⁹⁾ and, while in the society of the church, and seeking and enjoying the material advantages of such society, walked after their own ungodly lusts¹⁰⁾ and endangered the faith once delivered unto the saints.¹¹⁾ St. Peter, using very much the same language,¹²⁾ appears to have met with similar experiences. The later history of the *agapae*, which does not concern us here, also tells of various abuses. Yet in

1) Acts 2, 46.

2) Acts 20, 7.

3) Acts 20, 11; cf. v. 7.

4) 1 Cor. 11, 21.

5) Jude 12.

6) 1 Cor. 11, 17.

7) 1 Cor. 11, 27, 29.

8) Jude 12.

9) Jude 4.

10) Jude 18.

11) Jude 3.

12) 2 Pet. 2, 13.

the primitive church we hear of no prohibition of the *agapae* themselves. *Abusus non tollit usum.* Even the excesses at Corinth did not prompt the apostle to recommend the discontinuance of the *agapae*. His warning goes only against the abuse, and his admonition, toward the proper use. He concludes: *Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home.*¹⁾ The proper purpose of the *agape*, he would say, is not to appease your hunger, but to serve as an occasion for the exercise of brotherly love and other Christian graces.

d. PRAYER.

Religious worship, public or private, true or false, has never been without prayer or a semblance of prayer. It is, therefore, but natural that the early Christians, as a religious society, should exercise this duty enjoined upon all,²⁾ and this religious right, which is a birthright of every Christian, who, being a child of God, is in his right when he cries, *Abba, Father.*³⁾ Besides, we are expressly informed that the disciples at Jerusalem continued steadfastly $\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\zeta\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\omega\chi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\zeta$.⁴⁾ This says more than *in prayers*, as the Authorized Version has it; for the definite article indicates that these prayers were a stated, customary feature in their common religious life. Nor was this feature first introduced among these people when they became disciples of Christ. The Jews had their *hours of prayer*,⁵⁾ not only for private prayer, but for prayer as an act of public worship performed at the place of public worship.⁶⁾ Thus we find the disciples united in common *prayer and supplication*⁷⁾ before the day of Pentecost, and this practice was not discontinued afterwards. In the house of Mary we again find *many together praying.*⁸⁾ And thus, $\epsilon\nu\pi\alpha\tau\iota\tau\omega\pi\varphi$,⁹⁾ *in every place*, where

1) 1 Cor. 11, 33 f.

2) 1 Thess. 5, 17.

3) Rom. 8, 14 f.

4) Acts 2, 42.

5) Acts 3, 1.

6) Ibid. Cf. Luke 18, 10.

7) Acts 1, 14.

8) Acts 12, 12.

9) 1 Tim. 2, 8; cf. 1 Cor. 14, 15 ff.

Christians were gathered together to hear the word of God, there also the word to God was heard. *Heard.* For they lifted up their voice to God with one accord¹⁾ as they prayed, in the same meeting in which they spake the word of God with boldness.²⁾ When St. Paul exhorts that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority,³⁾ and, having stated his reason for such exhortation, continues, *I will therefore that men pray everywhere,*⁴⁾ he certainly includes the places of public worship when he says *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*. The churches are admonished to pray with all perseverance and *supplication for all saints*,⁵⁾ and especially for the apostle and his fellow ministers,⁶⁾ and for the success of their labors. Intercessory prayer for all men in general, for the Christian church and all its members, for the ministers of the church and their work, for civil governments and their officials, are thus seen to have been among the religious exercises of the early churches. And not only supplications and prayers, but also giving of thanks.⁷⁾ These sacrifices of the lips also took the form of *psalms and hymns and spiritual songs*,⁸⁾ not only in the Christian home, but also in the assembled congregations.⁹⁾ It appears that the gift of prayer and sacred song was among the special gifts of the Spirit for the edification of the church,¹⁰⁾ and that the laymen, *ἰδιώται*, those in the assembly who were not endowed with this peculiar gift, would indicate their participation in such prayer and thanksgiving by saying *Amen*.¹¹⁾ Thus was the royal priesthood united in showing forth the praises of him who had called them out of darkness into his marvelous light.¹²⁾ And this too for the edifying of the body of Christ. For as the pentecostal congregation voiced

1) Acts 4, 24. 31.

2) Acts 4, 31.

3) 1 Tim. 2, 1 f.

4) 1 Tim. 2, 8.

5) Eph. 6, 18.

6) Eph. 6, 19. Col. 4, 3 f. 2 Thess. 3, 1 f.

7) 1 Tim. 2, 1. Col. 3, 17; 4, 2.

8) Col. 3, 16. 17. Eph. 5, 19.

9) 1 Cor. 14, 15. 26.

10) Ibid.

11) 1 Cor. 14, 16.

12) 1 Pet. 2, 9.

forth in many tongues the wonderful works of God,¹⁾ so the themes of sacred song in the primitive church were, like those of the psalms of David's psalter, largely doctrinal and parenetic, and in *psalms and hymns and spiritual songs* the singers would teach and admonish one another while, at the same time, they edified themselves, singing with grace in their hearts to the Lord.²⁾ Thus did they *offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of their lips, giving thanks to his name.*³⁾

e. THE OFFERTORY.

Besides these sacrifices of the hearts and of the lips, the primitive church knew also of sacrifices of the hands, of which they were reminded by words as these, *To do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.*⁴⁾ Τῆς εὐποίιας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, says the original. The word *κοινωνία* is used in the same sense by St. Paul to the Corinthians⁵⁾ and to the Romans,⁶⁾ and the verb *κοινωνεῖν, to communicate,*⁷⁾ also signifies the act of *giving*. The word *κοινωνία* also stands for *fellowship.*⁸⁾ But when Luke says, the disciples continued steadfastly τῇ ὁδῷ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, the definite articles must not be disregarded as they are in the Authorized Version; and while the Revised Version has duly considered the articles before *κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου* and *προσευχαῖς*, and translates, *the breaking of bread and the prayers*, it still neglects two articles, that before *ἄρτου*, which, properly rendered, would make it *the breaking of THE bread*, and that before *κοινωνίας*, which forbids the translation, *the apostles' doctrine and fellowship*. Even the marginal reading, *in fellowship*, does not do justice to the original. Nor is it probable that *κοινωνία*

1) Acts 2, 11.

2) Col. 3, 16.

3) Hebr. 13, 15.

4) Hebr. 13, 16.

5) 2 Cor. 9, 13; 8, 4.

6) Rom. 15, 26.

7) Gal. 6, 6. Phil. 4, 15.

8) Gal. 2, 9. 2 Cor. 6, 14. 1 John 1, 3, 7.

means *fellowship* here at all. The apostles' teaching, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers, were certain stated acts performed in the meetings of the disciples, and since ἡ κοινωνία admits of a sense which fits into the series, that meaning would seem to deserve the preference. That ἡ κοινωνία, *the act of giving*, or, as we would say to-day, *the offertory*, or, *the collection*, was one of the acts of public worship in the primitive church may not only be surmised from what we read in the *Acts*, that those who would make contributions toward the charity funds of the congregation *laid them down at the apostles' feet*,¹⁾ but appears also from the recommendation of St. Paul to the churches of Galatia and of Corinth, to lay by in the treasury (*θησαυρίζων*) their contributions toward "the collection for the saints" *upon the first day of the week*,²⁾ the day of public worship,³⁾ that there should be no gatherings when he should come. This collection was, by the apostle, termed *προσφορά*, *an offering*,⁴⁾ and what the church of Philippi had *communicated*, *ἐκουνώντες*, to him, he received as *a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God*.⁵⁾ Thus we see that the offertories of the churches were not looked upon merely as *the ministering to the saints*,⁶⁾ as gifts to those who should enjoy them as the beneficiaries for whom they were intended, but as sacrifices offered up in the service of God as by an act of Divine worship. Hence, when Ananias brought his offering with fraud in his mind, he was considered guilty of *lying to the Holy Ghost*,⁷⁾ *not unto men, but unto God*.⁸⁾ The sacrifices of the hands were religious acts, the same in kind, though not in form, as *the sacrifice of praise to God, the fruit of the lips, giving thanks to his name*.⁹⁾

(To be continued.)

A. G.

1) Acts 4, 34 f.; 5, 2.

2) 1 Cor. 16, 1. 2.

3) Acts 20, 7.

4) Acts 24, 17.

5) Phil. 4, 15. 18.

6) 2 Cor. 9, 1.

7) Acts 5, 3.

8) Acts 5, 4.

9) Hebr. 13, 15. 16.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

I. MARRIAGE.

(Continued.)

The parties.

Marriage, as defined in an earlier chapter, is a joint status of one man and one woman. This is the doctrine both of the Divine law and of American law. The parties to the marriage enacted in Eden were one man, Adam, and one woman, Eve.¹⁾ And Adam, seeing through the nature of the institution thus established, says, *Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife.*²⁾ Christ also, pointing to the order of things established in the beginning, describes the ordinance of marriage as a union of a man and his wife in which *they twain shall be one flesh.*³⁾ Monogamy, not polygamy or polyandry, not the union of one man and two or more women, or of one woman and two or more men, but a union, a joint status, of twain, one man and one woman, is marriage as determined by the moral law inscribed into the human heart. According to the statutes of our States, polygamy, or the offense of having two or more husbands or wives at the same time, is not only illegal, invalid, and a tort against the innocent party, but a statutory crime which makes the offender liable to criminal procedure under an indictment by the grand jury, and, on conviction, to confinement in the state's prison. "So generally," says Tiedeman,⁴⁾ "and naturally is the evil character of polygamy recognized that the leading American authority on the law of marriage, without any qualification or preliminary explanation, defines marriage to be 'the civil status of one man and one woman united in law for life,' etc.⁵⁾

1) Gen. 1, 27; 2, 22; 3, 8. 20. 2) Gen. 2, 24. 3) Matt. 19, 5.

4) *Limitations of Police Power*, p. 539.

5) Bishop, Mar. and Div., § 3.

The law, however, the law of God as well as the law of the State, has not only determined the number of persons to be joined together in wedlock, but has also placed certain restrictions upon the choice of a partner in marriage, prohibiting certain persons from mutually becoming husband and wife. This leads us to treat of

Impediments of marriage.

a. Existing marriage.

Marriage being, as determined by law, essentially a status of two parties, the joint status of one man and one woman, every additional man or woman entering into sexual relation to the party of the other part does not really enter into the state of marriage. A husband who has a wife living cannot contract a real marriage with a second wife, and a woman having a husband living cannot contract a valid marriage with a second husband. The purported second marriage does not invalidate the first and valid marriage, though its consummation by carnal intercourse may be claimed as a cause of divorce by the innocent party to the first marriage. Hence, as a valid betrothal is, *in foro ecclesiae*, tantamount to marriage, as will be shown at length under a later head, a subsequent betrothal, while the first is in force, does not invalidate the first, but leaves it in full force, and binding on both parties. A second marriage may be valid after the dissolution of the first marriage by a valid divorce. Divorce is valid when it has been decreed as a final and absolute divorce *a vinculo* by a court which has jurisdiction over the case and in accordance with the laws determining the case. But the secular courts have no jurisdiction in the church, and the secular laws are not *lex fori* in the church. The church, on the other hand, has no jurisdiction in the State and over the civil status of its members. Hence a divorce may be valid and a second marriage lawful before the State, while the same divorce and remarriage may be unlawful before the church. In the Jewish

State under the political Mosaic law divorce by a bill of divorcement was legal and valid and subsequent remarriage likewise.¹⁾ Yet, judged according to the moral law, this same remarriage was adultery in both parties, *μοιχασθαι*, the union of a married woman with a man not her husband, and the union of a married man with a woman not his wife, before God.²⁾ In such cases a union sanctioned by the State must be condemned by the church. The Christian pastor cannot consistently solemnize a sin, and the Christian congregation cannot grant absolution to the sinner while he or she persists in what God stamps as adultery, though the State may have stamped it marriage. The church must insist upon the separation of the parties thus joined together, though after their separation the State will still consider them a married couple, and the return of either party to cohabitation with the spouse of the former marriage would be adultery before the State unless the second marriage had been previously dissolved by valid divorce and the first marriage restored by what would appear as a third marriage before the State. How a divorce might be obtained in such cases does not come under this head. What concerns us here is that after a first valid marriage a Christian cannot marry again unless the first marriage have previously been dissolved either by death or by a divorce which is valid and lawful both before the law of God and the law of the State.

Marriage being a status determined by law, the law determines the parties which may lawfully unite in wedlock also in other ways than by restricting their number to two. Thus the Divine law has drawn certain lines within which marriage shall not be contracted. These are the

b. *Prohibited degrees.*

The prohibited degrees within which marriage shall not be contracted are of two kinds, degrees of *consanguinity* and degrees of *affinity*.

1) Deut. 24, 1, 2.

2) Matt. 5, 32; 19, 9.

Consanguinity is the relationship which results from a common ancestry; affinity is relationship through marriage, or through carnal knowledge, whereby a man and a woman become one flesh.

Consanguinity is either *lineal* or *collateral*. Lineal consanguinity is the kinship of persons one of whom is the ancestor or descendant of the other, as between father and son, mother and son, father and daughter, mother and daughter, grandfather and grandson or granddaughter, grandmother and grandson or granddaughter. Collateral consanguinity is the relationship of persons descended from a common ancestor, but not from one another, as brothers and sisters, uncle and niece, aunt and nephew, cousin and cousin. These kinships are the same, whether they be of the *full blood* or of the *half blood*, i. e., whether the persons be descended from the same father and mother, or only from the same father or only from the same mother. And consanguinity is the same, whether it have arisen in wedlock or out of wedlock. But no consanguinity exists between children with no common ancestor. Thus when the widower A has a son, Y, by his first marriage, and widow B has a daughter, Z, by her first marriage, and A and B marry, no consanguinity exists between Y and Z. If, however, a child, M, is born to A and B, this child, M, is related by consanguinity, not only to A and to B, but also to both Y and Z.

Affinity is the kinship arising from the carnal knowledge of a man and a woman, whereby they become one flesh, either in¹⁾ or out of²⁾ wedlock. Thus, if the widow B have a daughter, Z, by her first marriage, and A marry B, then A and Z are related by affinity, though they are not related by consanguinity. But the marriage of A and B is supposed to have been consummated by coition; for this, not the marriage consent, forms the basis of affinity. Hence the affinity remains in force, even though the *vinculum*

1) Gen. 2, 24. Matt. 19, 5.

2) 1 Cor. 6, 16.

matrimoniale which has been established by the mutual consent of the parties, have been dissolved by divorce or death.

The degrees of consanguinity and affinity are most readily determined or computed by the rule laid down in the 18th chapter of Leviticus¹⁾ and the applications of this rule contained in the same chapter, which is the chief seat of the doctrine of prohibited degrees.

The wording of the rule in the original Hebrew is:—

אִישׁ אֵין אֶל-כָּל-שָׂאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ לَا תִּקְרַבְיָה לְלִלּוֹת עָרָה אֱנִי יְהָה:

which, literally translated, says, *Every man shall not approach to all flesh of his flesh to uncover nakedness. I am the Lord.*²⁾ That the words שָׂאֵר and בְּשָׂר jointly and severally signify kinship is out of question in view of the subsequent, specializing context, which specifies a long series of relationships; and that the words stand for both consanguinity and affinity is clear from the fact that throughout Lev. 18 these two kinds of kinship are mentioned promiscuously,³⁾ and from the use of שָׂאֵר and בְּשָׂר for degrees of consanguinity⁴⁾ and affinity.⁵⁾ That both שָׂאֵר and בְּשָׂר must be taken in the strictest sense is clear from the nature of the statute, which is not, as Lev. 25, 49 and Numb. 27, 11, an *enlarging* statute, intended to extend the limits of the law, but a *restrictive* statute intended to draw the line within which marriage shall not be lawful, the limit beyond which, as far as this rule is concerned, marriage shall be free. Thus, then, שָׂאֵר or בְּשָׂר is consanguinity or affinity of the first degree, as all lineal consanguinity,⁶⁾ or the nearest collateral consanguinity, as it exists between brother and sister,⁷⁾ or sister and brother;⁸⁾ or the nearest affinity, as between husband and wife.⁹⁾ Accordingly, שָׂאֵר describes

1) Lev. 18, 6.

2) Lev. 18, 6.

3) Lev. 18, 7. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 17. — 8. 14. 15. 16.

4) Lev. 18, 12. 13. 17; 21, 2. 3. Numb. 27, 11. Gen. 29, 14; 2, 23.

5) Gen. 2, 24; cf. Matt. 19, 5. Eph. 5, 29.

6) Lev. 18, 10. 17; 21, 2. 3.

7) Lev. 18, 12.

8) Lev. 18, 13.

9) Gen. 2, 24; 18, 8.

kinship of the next, the second degree, the collateral consanguinity existing between a son and his father's sister,¹⁾ a son and his mother's sister,²⁾ or affinity of the second degree, as between a man and his stepmother,³⁾ a father and his daughter-in-law,⁴⁾ a brother and his brother's wife,⁵⁾ a widower and his wife's daughter or granddaughter.⁶⁾ All these are not his flesh, akin in the first degree, but the flesh of his flesh, related in the second degree. What is beyond this degree, as, the daughter of his father's brother, or the daughter of his mother's sister, is the flesh of the flesh of his flesh, related to him in the third degree, and does not come within the prohibitory rule.

That the degrees of kinship encompassed by the rule Lev. 18, 6 are by this statute designated as prohibited degrees, within which marriage shall not be lawfully contracted, is also clear from the nature of the statute and the specifications following. The general statute as well as the special prohibitions annexed expressly state a certain limit of relationship within which the persons so related shall not become one flesh. This cannot mean extra-connubial intercourse, or fornication pure and simple, which is unlawful everywhere and lawful in no degree. What sense would there be in such legislation as this: *Thou shalt not murder thy wife, for she is thy flesh. Thou shalt not murder thy mother, for she is thy father's wife. Thou shalt not murder thy sister, for she is thy mother's child, etc.* And thus the meaning of the statutes of Lev. 18 cannot be: *No man shall commit fornication with the flesh of his flesh. That is to say, Thou shalt not commit fornication with thy mother, for she is thy mother, etc.* The summary of the English Bible at the head of the chapter is, therefore, correct when it says, "*Unlawful marriages.*"

Thus, likewise, the prohibition of marriage within the prohibited degrees of affinity specified Lev. 18, 8. 14. 15. 16,

1) Lev. 18, 12.

2) Lev. 18, 13.

3) Lev. 18, 8.

4) Lev. 18, 15.

5) Lev. 18, 16.

6) Lev. 18, 17.

to marry one's stepmother, uncle's wife, daughter-in-law, brother's wife, cannot refer to adulterous unions, while the reason given is the kinship; for adultery irrespective of kinship is expressly proscribed in a commandment of the decalogue and in the statute, *Thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife.*¹⁾ The supposition is evidently this that the marriage in which the affinity arose has been dissolved by divorce or death and the kinship remains and forms a bar to a marriage within the prohibited degree.

The various kinships in prohibited degrees specified in Lev. 18 are those of a man and his mother,²⁾ his stepmother,³⁾ his sister or half sister,⁴⁾ his son's daughter,⁵⁾ his daughter's daughter,⁶⁾ his stepmother's daughter,⁷⁾ his father's sister,⁸⁾ his mother's sister,⁹⁾ his uncle's wife,¹⁰⁾ his daughter-in-law,¹¹⁾ his brother's wife,¹²⁾ his wife's daughter or granddaughter.¹³⁾ That the specification is not intended to be exhaustive, and that the omission of a case is not a license, appears from the fact that the marriage with one's mother-in-law, which is not specified as incestuous in Leviticus, is proscribed with other incestuous unions in Deuteronomy,¹⁴⁾ and in view of the silence of all Scripture concerning the prohibition of a father's marriage with his daughter, which no sane man will consider exempt from the law of prohibited degrees. On the contrary, we know that such marriage is forbidden inasmuch as it comes under the general rule Lev. 18, 6 and the same degree is covered by special statutes, as vv. 7 and 10, stating the nearness of kinship as the reason for the prohibition. In like manner a man's marriage with his deceased wife's sister comes under the general rule, v. 6, she being the flesh of his flesh, and a parallel kinship, that of a man and his brother's wife, also made up of one degree of consanguinity and one of affinity,

1) Lev. 18, 20.

2) v. 7.

3) v. 8.

4) v. 9.

5) v. 10.

6) v. 10.

7) v. 11.

8) v. 12.

9) v. 13.

10) v. 14.

11) v. 15.

12) v. 16.

13) v. 17.

14) Deut. 27, 23.

is specified in v. 16. Again, the explicit prohibition of marriage with the daughter-in-law¹⁾ implies a prohibition of marriage with the mother-in-law, the two kinships being likewise equidistant and made up of the same elements of consanguinity and affinity.

That these statutes are precepts of the moral law binding upon all men appears from the repeated reference to the Gentiles who had practiced and still practiced the abominations prohibited in these statutes, and from the reference to the Divine punishment inflicted upon such Gentiles for such abominations.²⁾ The Gentiles are nowhere said to have incurred Divine punishment and defiled the land by not observing the Jewish Sabbath, or by eating pork, or by letting their cattle gender with diverse kind.³⁾ One who is not under a law cannot offend against that law and cannot be punished for that whereby he does not offend.

Yet while marriage in all these degrees covered by the formula of Lev. 18, 6, שָׂאֵר בְּשֶׁרֶת, is a moral offense, we must not overlook a distinction made by the Divine Lawgiver in dealing with the various carnal unions which come under the rule of prohibited degrees. According to Lev. 20, 11. 12. 14. 17 the death penalty was imposed upon the offenders against Lev. 18, 7. 8. 9. 15. 17, while of the offenders against Lev. 18, 12. 13. 14. 16 the Lord says, *they shall bear their iniquity, they shall die childless.*⁴⁾ Such marriages, when once contracted and consummated, were not to be dissolved. It is, therefore, consistent with the Divine prohibition as well as with the Divine concession, when we refuse to sanction the act of marrying a deceased wife's sister, but permit the status of marriage to continue undissolved, after the marriage has been consummated, just as God prohibited the parallel act of marrying the deceased brother's wife,⁵⁾ and yet suffered such marriage, when once brought about and consummated, to continue, not as an incestuous

1) Lev. 18, 15.

2) Lev. 18, 24—30.

3) Lev. 29, 19.

4) Lev. 20, 19—21.

5) Lev. 18, 16.

abomination, but as wedlock, though reserving to himself the denial of offspring to those who had entered such status against his will.¹⁾

This is, in its various bearings, the scriptural doctrine of prohibited degrees. The laws of our States are in many respects less, in some respects more, strict than the Divine law. Thus the Laws of Illinois, while prohibiting the marriage of first cousins by blood as "incestuous and void," knows of no prohibited degrees of affinity whatever, so that, according to the Illinois Statutes, marriage with the stepmother or the stepdaughter is not marriage within prohibited degrees. The same glaring inconsistency prevails in Missouri and a number of other States. The marriage of first cousins is prohibited by statute in New Hampshire, Ohio, Indiana, Kansas, Arkansas, Nevada, Washington, N. and S. Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Illinois, Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Missouri, and, perhaps, by recent legislation, in a few other States. Marriage is prohibited between a man and his niece, or a woman and her nephew, by blood, in N. H., Mass., Me., Vt., R. I., Ct., N. J., Pa., O., Ind., Ill., Mich., Wis., Io., Minn., Kan., Neb., Md., Del., Va., W. Va., N. C., Ky., Tenn., Mo., Ark., Tex., Cal., Ore., Nev., Col., Wash., Dak., Ida., Mon., Wy., S. C., Ala., Miss., N. M., Ariz.—In Del. and Ky. no man can marry the daughter of his brother's or his sister's child, and no woman the son of her brother's or her sister's child.—In Wis., Minn., N. C., and Ore. no marriage can be contracted "by parties nearer of kin than first cousins," whether of whole or of half blood. In O., Ind., Nev., Wash., Mon., not by persons nearer of kin than second cousins; in Ga. "not within the Levitical degrees." These prohibited degrees of consanguinity apply whether either person be legitimate or not, in N. Y., Ill., Kan., Neb., Ky., Mo., Ark., Cal., Col., Dak., Ida., Wy.,

1) Lev. 20, 21.

Ala., La., N. M., Ariz.—As to affinity, a man may not marry his father's widow, nor a woman her mother's husband, nor a man his wife's daughter, nor a woman her husband's son, in N. H., Mass., Me., Vt., R. I., Ct., N. J., Pa., Mich., Io., Md., Del., Va., W. Va., Ky., Tenn., Tex., Wash., S. C., Ga., Ala., Miss.—A man is not allowed to marry his grandfather's widow, nor a woman her grandmother's husband, nor a man his wife's granddaughter, etc., in Mass., Me., Vt., R. I., N. J., Pa., Mich., Io., Md., Del., Va., W. Va., Ky., Tenn., Tex., S. C., Ga., Ala.—A man may not marry his son's widow, nor a woman her daughter's husband, nor a woman her husband's father, etc., nor a man his mother-in-law, in N. H., Mass., Me., Vt., R. I., N. J., Pa., Mich., Io., Md., Del., Va., W. Va., Ky., Tenn., Wash., Ga., Ala.; nor a man his grandson's widow, nor a woman her granddaughter's husband, and inversely, in N. H., Mass., Me., Vt., R. I., N. J., Mich., Md., Del., Ky., Tenn., Wash., S. C.—In Va. and W. Va., a man cannot marry his wife's stepdaughter, nor a woman her husband's stepson, nor a woman her niece's husband. In W. Va., a man is also barred from marrying his nephew's widow, and in Ala. from marrying his uncle's widow. It seems that in Virginia, according to the construction of the Statute by the courts, marriages with the deceased brother's wife and the deceased wife's sister are still unlawful. Marriage with lineal ancestors or descendants, or between brothers and sisters of the half or the whole blood, is prohibited in all the States.

All these marriages within prohibited degrees are, either by the explicit statement of the Statutes, or by terms which imply the same, proscribed as void *ab initio*. Where they are declared "incestuous and void," and incest is an indictable offense, the offender makes himself liable also to criminal prosecution.

This is, as far as we can ascertain, the sum and substance of American statute law of prohibited degrees. That

it diverges in various points from the Divine law is plain. But divergence of laws is not necessarily a conflict of laws. Thus, the Divine law neither enjoins nor prohibits the marriage of cousins, and where the State prohibits such marriage, Christians will submit to such prohibition¹⁾ and abstain from such marriage or make their domicile in a State which has no such prohibition in its statutes, unless the statute provides that the marriage of first cousins domiciled in the State, if contracted in a State in which their marriage is valid, shall be held valid also in the State in which they are domiciled. Again, where the secular law knows of no prohibited degrees of affinity, while the Divine law prohibits marriage with "the flesh of one's flesh," also by affinity, there is no real conflict of laws, and a Christian will submit to the Divine law and abstain from such prohibited marriage. But where the State, in accordance with its statutes, has, through its authorized agent, pronounced and holds those husband and wife whose married state is prohibited by the moral law, there is a real conflict of laws, and the Divine law must prevail, and the church must demand a separation.²⁾ How, in such cases, a separation may be effected under the secular law must be considered under "*Divorce.*"

c. Mixed marriages.

There have been those who held the words of St. Paul, *Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers,*³⁾ to imply a prohibition of marriage between a Christian and an infidel, or between an adherent of the true religion and a person addicted to a false religion. If this were within the meaning of the apostle's words, then his admonition, *Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate,*⁴⁾ would make it a duty to a Christian husband or wife to leave the unbelieving spouse to whom he or she were joined

1) Rom. 13, 1. 2. 5.

2) See also *supra*, pp. 29—31.

3) 2 Cor. 6, 14.

4) 2 Cor. 6, 17.

in wedlock. But this would be in flat contradiction to what the same apostle had previously written to the same congregation, saying, *If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband.*¹⁾ That these mixed marriages are not likely to be happy marriages while the difference of religion lasts is taught by reason and experience. The hope of winning over the heterodox party is outweighed by the danger of apostasy to which the orthodox party is exposed. The education of the children of mixed marriages is an extremely difficult problem for all the parties concerned. For these and other reasons such marriages should be most earnestly dissuaded by pastors and parents, and the latter will in most cases act wisely and well in withholding their consent. But where parental consent has been granted and valid betrothal has ensued, it must stand and not be rescinded.

There is, however, another kind of mixed marriages which is prohibited by the laws of some of our States. Thus in Ind., Md., Del., Va., N. C., Ky., Tenn., Ark., Cal., Nev., Col., Ida., S. C., Fla., all marriages between a white and a negro or mulatto are prohibited; so in Mo. marriages between a white and a negro; in Tex., Ga., Ariz., between a white "and an African or descendant of Africans;" in Neb., Ore., Miss., Fla., between a white and "a person having one fourth;" in Ind., Mo., Fla., "one eighth, of negro blood;" in Md., N. C., Tenn., Ala., this prohibition extends to the third generation, inclusive. In N. C., Nev., S. C., all marriages between a white and an Indian, in Nev. and Ariz. between a white and a Chinese or Mongolian, in Ore. all marriages between a white and a

1) 1 Cor. 7, 12—14.

person having one fourth Chinese or Kanaka blood or one half of Indian blood, and in N. C. all marriages between an Indian and a Negro, are prohibited. In Michigan, where the law expressly pronounces marriages between a white person and one wholly or partially of African descent valid in all respects, and probably in all the States where the laws are silent on this point, such marriages, however repugnant they may be to the feelings of most people, are lawful, if not illegal for some other cause. Nor is difference of race an impediment of marriage according to the moral law. It should be noted, however, that these marriages, though valid where contracted, are not valid everywhere. Though married in a State where their marriage is lawful, the parties may be indictable for living together where it is not, and ignorance or mistake of law is not accepted as a defense for the offense of miscegenation.

d. *Other impediments.*

We have dealt with the impediments of marriage hitherto considered under the head of "*The Parties*," for the obvious reason that these impediments are such by the will of the Lawgiver or lawgivers that these persons shall not intermarry, even if they so desired and agreed. It is the will of God and of the State that marriage shall be monogamous, and therefore the law prohibits the marriage of a person already married. For reasons sufficient to God, and for reasons of public policy sufficient to the State, it is the will of God, or the will of the State, or the will of both, that persons already united by certain bonds of kinship or persons separated by barriers of race shall not be mutually parties to the same marriage, and hence the law prohibits such marriages.

There is, however, another class of impediments of marriage, which are also commonly enumerated under the head of "*The Parties*" in the text books, though they properly belong to a different chapter. The impediments

of the former class are such because the parties thus debarred *shall not* marry or intermarry; those of the latter class work as impediments of marriage because the persons in whom they are found are such that they *cannot* marry while these impediments exist. The persons thus incapacitated for marriage are infants, idiots, maniacs and other insane persons, and the hopelessly impotent, persons legally or actually incapable of entering into any valid contract at all, or in a manner physically defective to preclude their being a party to a contract which is to superinduce the state of marriage. The impediments of this class will, therefore, be taken up in the course of the subsequent chapter.

The contract.

Marriage is the status *superinduced and sustained by the lawful mutual consent of the parties to be and remain to each other husband and wife in a life-long union*. This mutual consent is the very essence of the act of marriage and remains the very essence of the state of marriage. Without this consent there is no marriage and can be no marriage. Without it a marriage ceremony is a mere form without substance, a sham or mock marriage which is marriage in no sense at all. Without this consent sexual intercourse is extra-connubial. *Consensus, non concubitus, facit matrimonium.* When this mutual consent is *de facto* lawfully complete and known to be so by the parties, marriage is essentially complete, even without a consummation. And in the absence of such lawful consent, no marriage exists, even with what may bear the semblance of a consummation with all its physical consequences.

This is the doctrine of Scripture. When the first woman had consented to be brought to the first man and the first man had accepted her, they were *the man and his wife*, even before a consummation had ensued.¹⁾ Jacob, on the

1) Gen. 2, 22—25.

strength of their mutual understanding, claimed Rachel as his wife even before he had gone in unto her.¹⁾ When Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together,²⁾ Joseph was her husband,³⁾ and she was his wife.⁴⁾ In Deuteronomy we read: *If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an HUSBAND, and a man find her in the city, and he lie with her, then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbor's WIFE.*⁵⁾ Here the man who has lain with a virgin who was betrothed to an husband is said to have humbled his neighbor's wife, though a consummation of the marriage had neither preceded the crime nor could ensue afterwards, because of the penalty to be inflicted. And this penalty was the same as that imposed upon an adulterer who had been found lying with a woman married to a husband in consummated marriage.⁶⁾ On the contrary, if a man had deflowered a virgin which was not betrothed, she was not by that act made his wife, but was in due process to be his wife, and they were not to be put to death as guilty of the crime of adultery.⁷⁾

But the marriage consent, in order to constitute the essence of marriage, must, in the first place, be real and *de facto* CONSENT, the concurrence and coincidence of two wills. Where there is no will, or but one will, there can be no consent; and where there are two wills, but no mutual concurrence, no *idem velle*, there is no consent. Will is the conscious self-determination of an intelligent being. Where there is no intelligence, as in an idiot, or no consciousness, as in a person who is in a state of stupor, or sleep, or delirium, or beastly intoxication, there can be no volition, and hence, no consent. But an insane person

1) Gen. 29, 21.

2) Matt. 1, 18.

3) Matt. 1, 19. 25.

4) Matt. 1, 20. 24.

5) Deut. 22, 23. 24.

6) Deut. 22, 22.

7) Deut. 22, 28 f.

may, in a lucid interval, when there is both intelligence and consciousness, exercise that self-determination which constitutes an act of the will and the concurrence of such will with another will, which is the essence of consent. Of course, the possibility of consent is not yet *de facto* consent, and where, permanent insanity being shown, consent during a lucid interval is claimed, two things must be proved, the lucid interval and the act of consent, and the burden of proof rests with the party making the allegations. On the contrary, where only occasional mental incapacity is proved, or drunkenness is alleged in denial of consent, the presumption is for mental capacity and the burden of proof lies on the party pleading incapacity at the time of the alleged marriage.

Want of capacity for the marriage consent is also presumed in infants, persons not sufficiently mature in years to understand the nature of marriage and its consequences, or to prompt their own acts in concurrence with rather than in submission to the will of others. At what age capacity may or must be assumed must, in the absence of law, be determined by the circumstances of each case. At common law a marriage of a person under seven years was void, a marriage of a male person between the ages of seven and fourteen, or of a female person between seven and twelve years of age was voidable, and a marriage of a male over fourteen, or of a female over twelve, was valid. This common law rule continues in States where the statutes are silent, or where they make it the statute law, as in N. H., Va., W. Va., Ky., La. In other States the limits of the age of consent are drawn higher. Thus the law declares the age of consent to be sixteen years in the male and fourteen in the female in Io., N. C., Tex.; seventeen in the male and fourteen in the female in Ill., Ark., Ga., Ala.; eighteen in the male and fifteen in the female in Wis., Minn., Cal., Ore., N. Dak., S. Dak., N. M.; eighteen in the male and sixteen in the female in O., Ind., N. Y., Mich., Neb., Nev.,

Ida., Wy., Ariz.; twenty-one in the male and eighteen in the female in Wash. and Mont. In Nev. males under twenty-one and females under eighteen, and in Md. and S. C. females under sixteen years must first obtain the consent of their fathers, mothers, or guardians. Other restrictions as to age are embodied in statutes in the form of directions to clerks or magistrates or persons empowered to solemnize marriages, forbidding them to issue licenses or certificates to or to solemnize the marriages of persons under a statutory age. Such statutes should be carefully heeded by ministers, although in the absence of nullity clauses they do not always affect the validity of the marriage, but may only affect its legality, and every one should thoroughly inform himself as to the state of the law in the State or States in which he may be called upon to officiate. Such age limits are recommended by reasons of public policy, to protect the young members of society against their own indiscretion and the evil designs or carelessness of others by certain rules, the application of which may easily decide what might otherwise be a very difficult question if the decision should depend upon the investigation of the mental capacity of such young persons in each individual case. The church, which is not endowed with legislative authority, cannot establish such rules, and it may become necessary, where the validity of betrothal is at issue, to base the decision on an investigation of the nature and circumstances of the case, as, f. ex., where a father and mother have prevailed upon a child of tender age to acquiesce in an engagement while real and actual consent may be doubted or denied. In all such cases it must be maintained that without actual and real consent there is no marriage or betrothal; that consent is not the *yea* of the mouth, but the compliance of the will, and that the one may be where the other is not; that volition presupposes a knowledge of that about which the will is concerned, and that there can be no marriage consent without a knowledge of what marriage is. With these principles

before them, those whose task it may be to investigate will know along what lines the investigation will have to proceed in order to ascertain the *facultas consentiendi*.

Yet in these and other cases it must also be remembered that *a posse ad esse non valet consequentia*. The capacity to consent is not tantamount to or proof of actual consent. If it were, then all who are capable of marriage would be actually married, which is absurd. A person may even be all the less inclined to marry the better he or she knows what marriage in general or a particular marriage implies. Consent is essentially an act of the will, and no amount of knowledge, which is essentially a matter of the understanding, can supply what the will alone can afford. Hence, where the will is not permitted to act, but is rather suppressed and overcome by *duress*, which is constraint by force or menace, there is no consent, though the lips have said *yea* where the heart has persistently said *nay*. Even going through a marriage ceremony under compulsion does not *eo ipso* constitute marriage, and a woman who, having for fear of death unwillingly performed her part in a ceremony and subsequently, under the same constraint, submitted to carnal intercourse, would, in the absence of real consent, be still unmarried, not a wife, but a ravished woman. And here it should be noted that duress is not an absolute quantity. The kind and amount of force or menace which may work as constraint in one case may utterly fail in another. What might have left a strong, robust and resolute woman undaunted and in the full exercise of her will, may overpower the will of a weak and timid, irresolute girl so as to wring from her lips what was never in her heart. On the other hand, not every exercise of constraint precludes real consent. If a father would say to the ravisher of his daughter: "Unless you marry the girl, I will have you sent to the penitentiary for rape," the man could not plead duress if he had yielded. He would have suffered no wrong if he had been imprisoned for his crime. He had no right, but only

an opportunity to escape punishment, and the choice between marriage and imprisonment was his own voluntary act.

Actual consent may also be excluded by mistaken identity, *error personae*, inasmuch as marriage consent is not willingness to marry in general, but willingness to marry a certain person. But *error personae* is not a mistake as to *what*, but as to *who* the party is. If a man has consented to marry Anne thinking her the heiress of a large estate, and afterwards learns that her sister Kate is the heiress and Anne is penniless, this is not *error personae*. Nor is mere mistake of name, as when a woman has consented to marry a certain son of the widow Jones and afterwards discovers that his name is Smith, he being a son of his mother by her first marriage. But if the widow had two sons, one Smith and one Jones, and the girl, willing to marry Smith and not Jones, had mistaken the one for the other, this would be *error personae* nullifying the consent, though no intended deception had been practiced by any party concerned.

Consent may, furthermore, be nullified by *fraud*, the deliberate deception of one party by another with or without accomplices. A person cannot be supposed to have willed what had never entered his mind, or to have willed against his will. Being made a party to a marriage ceremony declared to be in jest, and before a magistrate whose official character was denied, did not imply or express marriage consent, though the party who practiced the deception intended marriage. When A has asked B to be his wife and B has declared her willingness to have A for her husband, there is an apparent marriage consent. But when A afterwards learns that at the time of their agreement B was pregnant by another man, A is by such fraudulent concealment justified in declaring that marriage with a woman in such condition had never entered his mind and could never have been his will. But not every deception which may have contributed toward bringing about the consent

of the party deceived is sufficient to nullify such consent, which may have been prompted by other reasons. Where the deceived party, by a neglect of due care in so important a business, stands open to the charge of contributory negligence, the fraud is not sufficient cause to set aside the marriage. Least of all can the deceiving party plead his or her deceit to invalidate the other party's consent. For as no one must be allowed to profit by his own carelessness, so no one has a right to profit by his own wrong. Neither can the party to whom fraudulent statements were made, but who consented knowing them to be false or having reason to doubt their veracity, disclaim the validity of such consent, which was real and actual consent in the face of attempted fraud, consent which, once given, cannot rightfully be withdrawn. Thus the doctrine that fraud which totally excludes actual consent to a particular marriage invalidates such marriage is very simple and plain. But the application of the doctrine is often extremely difficult because of the difficulty of getting at the facts, especially since, as we shall presently see, the consent which was absent at an earlier period may have been given at a later time. Thus a case which has been complicated in the beginning may grow more and more intricate in its progress, until, at last, nobody in the world can say what, perhaps, nobody ever knew, whether there is or ever was marriage in the case or not.

There is no marriage where there is no marriage consent, whatever else there may be. It is only inasmuch as they exclude real and actual marriage consent that duress, error, and fraud are impediments of marriage. Hence marriage may ensue where, in the absence of other impediments, these preventives have ceased to operate. When constraint has been removed or overcome, when error has been detected, when fraudulent words or devices no longer deceive, the will may decide to acquiesce in what has been brought about by duress, fraud, or error, to accept the situation

which it might repudiate, and thus to make marriage what was not marriage before this compliance of the will. A woman may have been inveigled into a relation or condition which, while it is not marriage for want of consent on her part, was intended for marriage by the other party and places her before the alternative of repudiating the marriage at the cost of much annoyance and distress, or of yielding to prevailing circumstances and consenting to the marriage. If she choose the latter, she has made it marriage and cannot afterwards withdraw her consent because of fraud or duress experienced before she gave it. And if, having originally given a *quasi*-consent under compulsion or deception, she afterwards accepts an engagement ring and other presents, allows herself to be presented as the man's affianced, prepares her bride's outfit, and assists in buying the furniture, and all this when constraint was no longer exercised and fraud could no longer deceive, it is reasonable to assume that she has now given real consent and has bound herself when she might have claimed her freedom. What has been looked upon as the most emphatic, perhaps conclusive, confirmation of consent after duress, error, or fraud, is voluntary *copula carnalis*. But this doctrine must be received and applied with caution and restriction. Carnal knowledge may be due to incontinence with or without marriage consent, and though where it has taken place the presumption should not be for the sin and crime of fornication, but for intercourse under marriage consent, if such assumption is possible, yet the fundamental doctrine must stand that *consensus*, not *concupitus*, is the essence of marriage, and the one is not and cannot supply the other. To hold or admit that the status of marriage could be imposed upon or assumed by a non-consenting person would throw the law of marriage and its application into hopeless confusion. On the other hand, while the doctrine stands that where there is mutual marriage consent, and nowhere else, there is marriage, the question of law

remains plain and simple, and whatever obscurity there may be must be sought in the questions of fact. Where these questions cannot be satisfactorily settled, one of two courses only can be pursued. The one is determined by a maxim of expediency, the other by a maxim of justice. The maxim of expediency is, *Semper praesumitur pro matrimonio*. The maxim of justice is, *De occultis non judicat ecclesia*. In the administration of civil government, expediency must often be allowed to prevail. Marriage being a most important part of the groundwork of human society, it is wise and expedient to sustain marriage where it can be sustained, and in doubtful cases a court may find for marriage rather than against it. In the church, wherever the law, the unalterable norm of right and wrong, must be applied, the question can never be, What is expedient? but must always be, What is right before God? Hence, *in foro ecclesiae*, marriage must not be presumed, but must be proved, before a person can be held bound in marriage or guilty of having broken the marriage bond. Where fraud or duress is charged in defense, these charges, too, must be proved before they can serve to justify that for which the defense was set up. Where neither the existence nor the absence of lawful mutual consent can be proved, the church can neither condemn nor justify, but must dismiss the case for lack of evidence, leaving it to God and to the conscience of each party to adjudicate whereof the church cannot judge. This amounts to an acquittal as far as the unsustained charges are concerned, and the parties so accused but not convicted must be treated as if the charges had never been made. But such acquittal is not properly a justification, not a declaration that no duress or fraud on the one part or no breach of marriage consent on the other part had been committed; the questions of fact and the judgment thereon are left to Him who knows all things.

(*To be continued.*)

A. G.

HIGHER CRITICISM IN THE PULPIT.

The story goes of a rationalistic theologian at one of the German universities a hundred years ago, that a student who had fed on his thistles through several semesters and was about to go into the ministry complained to him of his misgivings as to the wisdom of preaching to the congregation what he had heard in the lecture room. "You blooming idiot," said the Professor, "do you think I told you these things that you should go and preach them to the people? Give them what the Catechism says." Rationalism is certainly bad enough in the theological lecture room, as smallpox in a hospital. But when a hospital nurse who has taken the disease goes out in a state of efflorescence to serve as a cook for healthy and unsuspecting people, it is time that the police should interfere and put a stop to her nefarious business.

Higher criticism is a disease which is a thousand times worse than smallpox, and those who are infected with it are in a bad plight themselves and a menace to the inmates of the wards in which they wear their garb and badge of "scientific theologians." We have all heard of Dr. Briggs, and we pity him and the students of Union Seminary, many of whom are not vaccinated. But when he comes out of that hospital and goes into the pulpits of the "Church of the Holy Communion, New York," "Trinity Church, Pittsburgh," "St. Bartholomew's, New York," "the Church of the Messiah, Brooklyn," and other churches, where men, women, and children, who come for edification, not to be inoculated with "scientific theology" and "higher criticism," are exposed to his contagion, and when we think that other preachers covered with the same scab will follow his example, we pity the people among whom the epidemic is sure to spread. To make matters worse, the sermons which Dr. Briggs preached in those churches have been published in a volume entitled, *The Incarnation of the Lord*, a series

of sermons tracing the unfolding of the doctrine of the incarnation in the New Testament. By this vehicle the virus of modern theological unbelief will be carried into the circulation of thousands who would not have thought of exposing themselves to the dangers of Union Seminary, the more so, as the Doctor makes the book an advertising medium for his earlier writings, his "*Messianic Prophecy*," "*the Messiah of the Gospels*," "*the Messiah of the Apostles*," the "*General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*," which are recommended in the "Preface" and by frequent references in the footnotes of the "Sermons."

In these "Sermons" the Higher Criticism manifests itself to the discerning eye as the base and shameless swindle which it is at all times and everywhere. These "Sermons" and the book in which they are here embodied presuppose hearers and readers who are ready to repose simple and childlike faith in everything except the Holy Scriptures. To base Christian faith upon such arguments as those advanced by this preacher is simply impossible, and whoever professes to believe the doctrine of the Incarnation, the fundamental fact of the Christian religion, on the strength of the methods pursued in these "Sermons," is either credulous enough to believe almost anything or dishonest enough to profess almost anything. The only sufficient basis on which Christian faith may rest, the assurance that the writings of the Old and the New Testaments are the word of God, is here discarded, and in its stead human conjectures, fancies and falsehoods are made the foundations of theories which are dished out as historic and religious truths.

In the first Sermon the preacher quotes a number of sayings of Jesus in which the term *Son of Man* is used. "A very large proportion of these," we are told, "come from the Logia of St. Matthew, that large collection of the Wisdom of Jesus that St. Matthew issued in the Hebrew language, and in the measures of Hebrew Wisdom, before

any of our present Gospels were composed.''¹⁾ The preacher then proceeds to quote a number of dicta of Christ, which he introduces with the statement: "These words of Jesus are from the *Logia*." The quotations are from the synoptic Gospels. In a footnote the author says: "In this case and in those that follow an effort has been made to find the original words of Jesus at the basis of the several texts."²⁾ And in another note: "The original form of these *logia* differs slightly from the several versions given in the Gospels. The laws that govern the forms of Hebrew Wisdom enable us to determine it."³⁾ This is Higher Criticism. The sources from which Dr. Briggs has these sayings of Jesus are the synoptic Gospels, such passages as Matt. 13, 41. Mark 8, 38. Luke 9, 26; cf. Matt. 10, 33. 12, 9.—Matt. 24, 37—39. Luke 17, 26—30; cf. Matt. 24, 14.—Matt. 10, 23. Luke 11, 30. But he quotes them expressly as from "the *Logia*." Of course, he never saw this "collection of the Wisdom of Jesus," issued by St. Matthew "in the Hebrew language, and in the measures of Hebrew Wisdom." Nor has anybody else ever seen it, or said that he had seen it. These *Logia*, purported to have been compiled by St. Matthew "before any of our present Gospels were composed," are simply a critical nightmare brought on by misinterpreted statements of or concerning Papias found in Eusebius, a fiction unknown to all Christian antiquity and hooted down by some of the Higher Critics themselves. Yet Dr. Briggs quotes from "the *Logia*," which no man has ever seen or professed to have seen, and what he has not found in the *Logia*, but simply in the Gospels. But then, every intelligent child of twelve years and average attainments can quote from the Gospels, while it takes a "D. D., D. Litt." to quote from the *Logia*, especially when "the original form of these *logia*," which no one has ever seen, "differs slightly from the several versions given in the Gospels." What manner of "Science" and of foun-

1) P. 8.

2) P. 9.

3) P. 10.

dation for Christian faith can this be? Are we to base our faith on the Gospels or on something else? St. John says of the things written in his book, *These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ.*¹⁾

But what does our homiletical Higher Critic say concerning this foundation of our faith, the Gospel of St. John?

"It is doubtless true that in this Gospel we are not so near to the exact words and the exact conceptions of Jesus as in the sayings of the Logia of St. Matthew and in the Synoptic Gospels. The author, I think, translated an original Hebrew Gospel of St. John, and enlarges it with explanatory words and sentences setting forth the thinking about Jesus' life and teachings current toward the close of the century among the pupils of St. John."²⁾

This is an execrable piece of jugglery. Starting in with the assertion, "It is doubtless true," the preacher would make the woman in the pew believe what is doubtless untrue, and disbelieve what is doubtless true. When Lessing, whose talent for criticism stood head and shoulders above Dr. Briggs, struck his critical blows against the four Gospels, he expressly gave his ideas as by way of "Hypothesis," and looked toward "men of cool critical erudition" as his judges. This preacher in the pulpit palms off his less than hypothetical falsehoods as "doubtless true," and that upon hearers many or most of whom are utterly destitute of critical training and equipment. But Dr. Briggs has still more to say to the woman in the pew concerning the Gospel of St. John:—

"The Gospel has an introduction in verses 1—18 of the first chapter. This seems to be a Christian hymn of the incarnation. This hymn was probably sung in the churches of Asia towards the close of the century, for it has measured lines and strophical organization."³⁾ . . . "But the prologue of St. John's Gospel goes further, and

1) John 20, 31.

2) Pp. 52 f.

3) Pp. 191 sq.

that in the line of thought of the Jewish philosopher Philo.''¹⁾ . . . "And so the author of the Christian hymn to the Logos introduces into the New Testament, and into Christian theology, this speculative, philosophic way of thinking about the relation of the Son of God to the Father.

"It is no disparagement to Christianity, as some people think, that it uses the best thoughts that have come to men outside the sphere of divine revelation. It is rather an evidence of a sublime confidence in truth and fact. The best Christian scholars from St. John's time onward have not hesitated to recognize and use, in constructing Christian theology and Christian institutions, all that is good and true and noble in the religions and philosophies formed outside the ranges of divine revelation. They did this, because they recognized that the divine Word is the light of the world, and that he shines in some measure in all ages and in all lands, struggling with the darkness everywhere, and imparting gleams of light even in the darkest minds. We ought, therefore, to expect to find the light of truth in such a profound thinker as the Jewish philosopher Philo, and in the Greek philosopher Socrates.

"This first introduction of philosophy into Christian theology by the author of this early Christian hymn was only the first wave of a flood of thought which gave Christian theology its philosophical form for all time. The Greek mind had been trained by the divine Word to make this contribution to Christian theology.''²⁾

It is to be feared that the woman in the pew who goes to hear Dr. Briggs in the pulpit is no less credulous than the preacher, who, in the beginning of his sermon, speaks of what "seems to be" a Christian hymn which was "probably" sung in Asia, and before he has finished one-fourth of his discourse has thrown all reserve and caution to the winds and speaks of "the author of the Christian hymn to

1) P. 193.

2) Pp. 194 f.

the Logos" and "the author of this early Christian hymn," as later on of "the poet," of "our poem," with all the familiarity of an old acquaintance, although that nameless "poet" has no more existence in history than the man in the moon. A person who so easily persuades himself from conjecture to history is pretty sure to persuade others, if not by his argument—which he does not as much as attempt—yet by the example of credulity which he sets. That this fictitious poet was not an original thinker, but borrowed, bought or inherited his contribution to Christian theology from "the Jewish philosopher Philo," is but another fiction of Dr. Briggs or those from whom he borrowed or bought it, though the woman in the pew will probably give the preacher all the credit for what she will consider his discovery. But there is one lonesome truth for which we too would give the Doctor credit. It is the acknowledgment that "some people" think it a disparagement to Christianity to attribute a truth of divine revelation to the Jewish philosopher Philo as its originator. "Some people" know what Christianity is, and some people, among them Dr. Briggs, do not, and the Doctor may be right when he considers *his* "Christianity" and "Christian theology" largely indebted to Philo and Socrates and similar holy men of God.

Here is some more Higher Criticism, taken from the last sermon in the series:

"The Gospel of St. Luke was written at a much earlier date than the Gospel of St. John, not far from the date of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This Gospel, in its preface, recognizes the use of written sources of an earlier date. Among these we may easily determine the primitive Gospel of St. Mark, and the original Gospel of St. Matthew in the Hebrew language, known as the Logia, or Sayings of Jesus. Besides these, St. Luke evidently used other documents for his story of the birth and infancy of Jesus. The main stock of the story is comprised in a series of Christian poems,

many of which have been used from the earliest times, as the Canticles of the Christian Church: such as the Ave Maria, the Magnificat, the Benedictus, the Nunc Dimittis. These were originally composed in the Hebrew language, with measured lines and strophical organization, and were, in all probability, among the earliest, if not the earliest Christian hymns. They were sung in Jewish Christian congregations before the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore belong in the earliest group of Christian documents, the primary written sources of Christianity. We have seen that the doctrine of the incarnation as the divine Word becoming flesh was first sung in a hymn in the Greek congregations in Asia. The doctrine of the incarnation as a virgin birth is in a hymn of the Jewish congregation in Palestine, at least twenty years earlier.¹¹⁾

"As has been said, this doctrine is in the Ave Maria, or Annunciation to the Blessed Virgin. This annunciation is in the form of a poem. It was written by an early Christian poet. It was certainly composed in the Jewish-Christian community in Palestine, which was nearest to the Virgin Mary. The author must, therefore, have known the mind of the Jerusalem or Galilean community as to the Mother of Christ Jesus."¹²⁾

"One of the evidences of the early date of this doctrine, and of the hymn which enshrines it, is that it sings of the virgin birth of the Son of God, and seems to know nothing at all of his pre-existence. There is nothing in the hymn to suggest even ideal pre-existence."¹³⁾

"As the ancient Jewish poet thought of the divine Spirit as hovering over primitive chaos with creative energy to bring light, life, and order out of it;¹⁴⁾ as another Jewish poet saw God Himself present in theophany, moulding the body of man out of clay soil, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life,¹⁵⁾—so an early Christian poet conceived

1) Pp. 215 f. 2) P. 218. 3) P. 222. 4) Gen. 1. 5) Gen. 2.

of the divine Spirit as overshadowing the Virgin Mary, and imparting His divine power to enable her to conceive the man Jesus.''¹⁾

Enough of this. We might continue to copy pages of similar trash from the output of this poet-factory into which this preacher converts a Christian pulpit. Of course, it is of little consequence to Dr. Briggs whether the Ave Maria be the product of a fictitious poet or a revelation of the Holy Ghost. He says:—

“All that we have thus far learned of the incarnation, from the teaching of Jesus, and the writings of St. Paul, St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, would stand firm if there had been no virgin birth; if Jesus had been born of Joseph and Mary, having father and mother, as any other child. Therefore the virgin birth is only one of many statements of the mode of the incarnation. It has no documentary value, no more intrinsic importance, than any other of the many we have thus far studied. The doctrine of the incarnation does not depend upon the virgin birth. Since all the other passages relating to the incarnation, except that of the Gospel of the Infancy, know nothing of the virgin birth, it is only a minor matter connected with the incarnation, and should have a subordinate place in the doctrine.’’²⁾ Oh yes, the woman in the pew and her children may want the Virgin’s babe who was cradled in a manger. “The favorite idea of the incarnation among the people has ever been the simpler one of the virgin birth, as in the Ave Maria. The theologians have ever preferred the more profound doctrine of the Hymn of the Logos.’’³⁾ So says the man in the pulpit; and by and by the woman in the pew may, under such influence and with a little superficial reading, learn to consider the “simpler idea” below her dignity also and leave it to her children and to the common people.

1) Pp. 225 f.

2) P. 217.

3) P. 224.

But what will the *man* in the pew have to say about these things? Well, in the first place, the probability is that the man will not be in the pew very much where preaching like that of Dr. Briggs has become acceptable. And if he be there, the probability is that he will say what the woman says and do as the woman does. When the devil dispenses his theology and people go to hear him, things are likely to take the course they took when Higher Criticism was first taught and practiced in Eden, where the question, "*Yea, hath God said?*" was followed by the negation, "*Ye shall not surely die,*" and the woman did eat of the forbidden fruit, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. There will be exceptions. There will be those who will go to hear Dr. Briggs as one goes to a menagerie. Even some of these may come to grief, as boys in a menagerie who go too near the cages. There will be men, especially lawyers and business men, who want facts and evidence, and there will also be women who want something whereon to base their faith; and all these will decline to invest in this kind of wildcat stock. But there are many who will take to popularized Higher Criticism, as boys in kneepants take to swearing and cigarettes, because it makes them feel big, while they are only bad boys.

A. G.

WHAT READEST THOU?

A Question to the Pastor.

What readest thou? is a question to which peculiar importance attaches in these days when there is such a vast amount of literature and such a wide range of choice between good and bad, profitable and unprofitable reading. In reading the eyes are the avenues to the inner man, and the matter read is the food for the mind and soul. Naturally, the effect will be similar as in taking food for the body.

Every one knows that it is by no means something indifferent what kind of food and drink he takes. Healthy food nourishes and supports the physical life, poison destroys it. Bread strengthens, liquor weakens the body, and adulterated food will gradually vitiate the system. Whether the soul is edified and the mind ennobled, or the soul destroyed and the mind debased by reading depends in part on *how* you read, but mainly on *what* you read. Imbibing obscene literature will beget a filthy mind, romances will fill the brain with idle imaginings; poetry and prose of sterling worth will create nobility of sentiment.

The books, periodicals, and papers which you read are your companions. Now the adage has it: Tell me with whom you associate, and I will tell you what you are. The truth of this saying is confirmed by the Scripture declaration: "Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners," 1 Cor. 15, 33. There may be some strong minds that can repel all the influences of their companions and surroundings, but there are not many such strong characters under the sun. The average mortal will be like his fellows. "At Rome you will do as Rome does," that is the rule. Your companions whose company you keep day after day will modify your principles, mold your mind, govern your taste, direct the channel of your thoughts. In reading a book you are keeping the author's company, and even when reading to refute him it is not always easy entirely to withdraw yourself from his influence.

Because reading has such a powerful influence either to ennoble or to debase, either to build or to destroy, a peculiar duty devolves on the minister of the Gospel in this respect. He should not only watch over the literature read in his own family, he should also have an eye to the books and periodicals which come to the homes of his members, and he should moreover see that he himself does the right kind of reading, so as to be a safe guide to others. Do you frequently ask others: What do you read? and do you never put

that question to yourself? "The husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits," writes Paul 2 Tim. 2, 6. The minister who, at least in a measure, is to direct the reading of others, will do well in sometimes putting the question to himself: What readest thou?

Dost thou every day spend hours together reading the newspapers? The minister of Christ should be so far acquainted with current events as to be able to judge of the signs of the times and so to comply with the word of the Lord Matt. 16, 3, but much newspaper reading is of evil, because by it much precious time is lost and because it has the tendency to distract the mind from those things with which the minister of Christ should be occupied continually. The pastor who daily devours a square yard of newspaper in the morning is very apt to talk politics in the evening or to discuss the happenings of the day, when he should rather speak of things that are profitable unto edifying. The pastor ought to set an example of moderation in newspaper reading.

What readest thou? Novels? To spend whole days reading novels, as is sometimes done, is a thing which deserves unmitigated condemnation. A pastor who does this is setting a bad example to his youthful parishioners, and though he does it privately, yet it is very apt to become known and to be imitated. The pastor is called to save souls, but in setting an example of novel reading he does that which tends to destroy souls.

What readest thou? Philosophy? astronomy? science? poetry? There is a kind of reading which is commendable. Some of these branches of knowledge are taught at colleges and seminaries for the education of the mind, and they should not be laid aside altogether when entering on the active work of the ministry, but they must ever be regarded only subordinate helps and aids in the work of the ministry. Though the reading of philosophy may be exceedingly delectable to the mind, yet with the minister of Christ theology must ever remain the mistress, philosophy the hand-

maid, and he must never forget that it is not right to court the maid more than the mistress. Among the "allotria" which a minister must not allow to infringe on his official work Dr. C. F. W. Walther names also "music, painting, scientific studies, literary activity." (*Pastorale*, § 11, Note 2.) *Spare* time may be profitably devoted to history, science, or poetry, but the pastor's first duty is to live up to the command: "Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry," 2 Tim. 4, 5. Devoting much of his time and attention to other than theological reading is also connected with a peculiar danger to the minister. If the reading of science and of belles-lettres leads the pastor to think the presenting of the simple truths of the Gospel on a plain platter too common a thing and he begins to aim at regaling his hearers with a garland of flowers picked from the garden of poetry and often borrowed from heathen singers, then his labors are lost to the kingdom. Flowers soon fade, and only those sermons can bring fruit unto life eternal which are patterned after those of the man who wrote: "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," 1 Cor. 2, 4, 5. Certainly the preacher should use becoming language and a graceful style,—vulgar language and the arts of the mountebank disgrace the pulpit,—, but sensational preaching and the delivering of attractive addresses which are often overloaded with all manner of artistic embellishments is one of the most baneful faults of our modern pulpit in which poets, orators, and tourists are more frequently quoted than the apostles and prophets. Watch thou in all things, also in reading belles-lettres, and do not allow them to crowd the Word of the Cross in your sermons, lest souls arise and accuse you of feeding them on pictures instead of bread. And be careful to heed the warning of Paul: "Beware lest any man spoil

you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ," Col. 2, 8. If your mind is philosophically inclined indulge it not too far and be on your guard lest in your heart the maid and the mistress exchange places. Be not carried away by the tendency of the age to subordinate the Bible to science. The Bible first, science second. The Bible is always right, science is often wrong.

What readest thou?

The Bible enjoins reading: "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine," 1 Tim. 4, 13, and if Timothy would have asked what books he should read Paul would have pointed to the sacred roll. Searching the Scriptures is enjoined upon all, but more especially on the clergy. The minister of the Gospel is to preach Christ. Now Christ says: "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me," Ps. 40, 7. This volume of the book, the scroll of the Scriptures, a minister must study if he is to preach Him who is its author.

Readest thou the Scriptures?

There are pastors who read theology much and the Scriptures little. They glean their sermons from the writings of some renowned men, and the Bible serves them only for a book from which to take a text, and even this they perhaps read only once. Readest thou theology, and readest thou not the Bible? Why forever drink from the rivulet? Why not ascend up higher and test the fountain? Are you commanded to preach the theology of the past and present? or are you not rather commanded to preach the Scriptures? Rest not content to read the Bible through others, read it yourself. To read theology and not to read the Bible is a precarious thing. The "helps" to the pastor which are now flowing from the press in a broad stream are but too frequently helps to help him away from the Bible.

Thou readest theology—what theology readest thou? Lutheran? sectarian? scientific? old? new? What are the

names of the authors whom you have invited to a place on your shelves? To what school do the books belong which you most frequently consult?

Years ago we had a neighbor, a Lutheran minister, who was in the habit of saying, "by his library no one could tell what he was, a Lutheran, Presbyterian, or Methodist." It was indeed uncertain what the man was. This only was certain, he was anything but a Lutheran. Seeing such a medley collection of books in which all shades of heresy and sectarianism, from Jung Stilling to Brigham Young, are represented, one receives the impression that the owner of that library must himself be a little of everything and a piece of nothing. A preacher can be judged pretty safely by his library. If you see whole shelves filled with novels you conclude that he is a novel reader; if you find the poets of all lands represented you take it that he is a lover of poetry; if you see that the writings of sectarians and heretics predominate you will infer that the owner is himself a sectarian, or that a whole menagerie of wild beasts are jumbled up in his brain which still retain the nature of the jungle although given orthodox names; but if you find a library the bulk of which is composed of Lutheran works of sterling worth from old time and new you understand that its owner means to be a Lutheran. It is a deplorable thing that so many who are called Lutheran ministers have sectarian libraries. As a matter of course a Lutheran pastor ought to have a Lutheran library.

Well, ought not a preacher to be able to judge and to distinguish truth from error? And may he then not safely use books of all kinds? We readily assent to that if it is applied to learned professors and old, experienced men, but it sounds very different from the mouth of a young man. Is it a crime to be young? No indeed! Neither is it a crime to be youthfully innocent. The young man but recently out of school who thinks he can use the works of sectarians with perfect discrimination, because he has learned to count

the articles in which they err at his fingers' ends, is an innocent who has not yet probed the depths of Satan, or there is a soft spot about him where self-conceit has its seat.

A healthy man may receive bruises from external causes when his system remains sound, but running sores are a proof of a diseased system. Quenstedt errs on the duties of civil government, but his system is sound and offers all the means to correct that error; but John Calvin was a fanatic who laid down false principles of theology and these corrupt the whole system, tinge every article of faith, and have led to an endless split-up of sects and sectlets, and resulted in a spirit of liberalism akin to infidelity. Now if a young man uses the books of Calvinists day by day and week after week and often reads very hastily in gathering material for a sermon, he can scarcely escape being tinged with the Calvinistic spirit. He will probably not imbibe Calvin's errors on predestination and the sacraments, but the Calvinistic atmosphere will by and by become congenial to him, and when this has come about, then the spirit of Luther has fled from him.

We would most earnestly advise every young man who enters the ministry of the Lutheran church against loading the shelves of his bookcase with sectarian works, however great their renown may be and however cheap they may be offered him. If his library is composed of sectarian works and he is not too busy or too indolent to use it, it will surely in a measure mold his faith and will have a deleterious effect on his preaching. Lutheran pastors should provide themselves with Lutheran books even if they cost more money. Better a small library of select Lutheran works than a jungle of books of every spirit that it almost seems dangerous to stand them side by side. A bishop is to be "a lover of good men," Tit. 1, 8. See that you have good men to associate with in your study. Better a half dozen lovers of the truth, though they present an uncouth exterior, than a dozen gilded bards of doubtful tune. Eat that which is wholesome: read that which is good.

F. K.

PARAGRAPHS ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

Some people are working with might and main to introduce the Bible into the public schools, and we are inclined to think they will succeed at least in part. The movement has been under way for some time, and the wind is shifting in its favor rather than against it. The religious press, the pulpit, conferences and conventions, individuals who have the public ear, are putting their shoulders to the wheels or hitching themselves to the traces. Judges and other State officials, politicians and the secular press are beginning to swing into position. By and by, petitions will be carted into our legislative halls, bills will pass through the first and second reading and go into the hands of the committees, there will be hearings and pleadings in the committee rooms, and finally the majority will have its way, and *something* will go into the public schools. What that will be is a different question. That it will be the Bible is hardly probable. It may be the New Testament. It may be a small volume of selections from both Testaments, a book prepared expressly for the public schools and approved by the organs of the State.

The final success of this movement will be chiefly owing to the fact that there is certainly something wrong about the public schools, something so thoroughly and unquestionably wrong that the most energetic efforts should be made to correct it. And while there were always those who knew that there was something wrong, there were many more who did not know, and who did not believe it when they were told, who looked upon our public school system as little short of perfection, as the pride of the nation, the Palladium of our country. Of late, however, growing numbers of these enthusiasts have begun to sober down and to awake to the fact, the undeniable fact, that there is indeed something wrong. Hence this growing un-

rest and this increasing demand that something must be done. Hence this movement to introduce the Bible into the public schools.

The endeavor to place the Bible in the public schools is but an effort to right one wrong by another wrong. Those who advocate the measure are physicians who have made a wrong diagnosis. They know that the patient is sick, but they do not know what ails him. The trouble with the public schools is not that something is not there which ought to be there, but that there is a large element there which should not be there. And no amount of addition will bring the correct answer where subtraction is required. This element which should not be in the public schools at all is made up of thousands upon thousands of children whose parents should know better than to send their children to a school which by its very nature excludes and must exclude religious training from its curriculum. The presence of these children in the public schools is the fundamental wrong with which we have to contend and for which there is but one remedy, to take these children away from where they do not belong and put them where they belong.

There is no religious training in our public schools, and this is not wrong but right. These schools are institutions of the State, a purely secular state, which very properly leaves the care of their souls, their relation to God, all their spiritual interests, to the citizens themselves. To define the religious duties of the citizen, to determine what is sin and what is righteousness before God, to lead the sinner to settle his account with God, all this is not within the province of the State. But these are precisely the fundamentals of all religious training and instruction. It is in these points that Jews and Christians, Roman Catholics and Protestants, Lutherans and Baptists, differ and must be per-

mitted to differ without interference on the part of the State. But instruction in conflict with or deviating from any citizen's conviction in any point of religion, when imparted in a State school and by a teacher employed by the State, is State interference which no citizen entitled to the use of such school should be made to suffer. The Jewish child is taught that to embrace Christianity is the fearful sin of apostasy from the God of Israel, and the State has no right to teach that child what the New Testament teaches, or what Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ and an apostate in the eyes of the Jew, inculcates in the name of Christ, who died under the anathema of the high priest of Israel. That the Jewish child is wrong does not give the State a right to correct him by an opposite doctrine. If it did, the State might go ahead and tell the Roman Catholic child that he is wrong in praying to the Virgin, and where would it all end but, consistently, in religious persecution? If the New Testament is a religious book, teaching and inculcating a religion other than that of the Jew, it is certainly out of place in an American public school as long as the Jew is capable of American citizenship.

Should all the millions of Christian children then grow up without adequate religious instruction merely on account of the comparatively few Jewish children in the public schools? Certainly not. *Our* children are not growing up without religious instruction, daily religious training in a Christian school, and in our synod there are nearly a hundred thousand children enjoying the same benefit. These children are where they properly belong, Christian children in Christian schools, Lutheran children in Lutheran schools, and we do not see any sufficient reason in the world why Methodist children should not receive religious training in Methodist schools, and Baptist children in Baptist schools and Presbyterian children in Presbyterian schools. Then these children would be where they properly belong. The

Bible, too, would be read and studied in all these schools, and being in the hands of Christian teachers and Christian children, the Bible, too, would be where it properly belongs.

But what of those thousands of children whose parents are not Christians? Should they be left to grow up without schools like the little South Sea Islanders? Well, no. In the first place, the little South Sea Islanders are not all growing up without schools. Many of them are being trained in better schools than the children of some American parents who contribute toward the maintenance of the missionary schools thousands of miles away. And why should not mission schools be established in our large cities? We have a school right here in St. Louis for children in the slums, no matter what their parents may be, and scores and hundreds of similar schools might be established by the churches in our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the Bible and religious instruction in every one of them. What a field for such work New York and Philadelphia and Chicago and San Francisco would be!

We are well aware that we could not expect to get all the children of unchurchly people to attend slum mission schools. Some of these people do not live in the slums. Some of them live in the West End. But even some of these would gladly send their children to Christian schools if the churches in their neighborhood were alive to their duty and carried on schools for their own children. When we were a boy in a Christian school, we had schoolmates who were the children of wealthy infidels, although a public school was but a few blocks away, and we know of very genteel infidels who are sending their children to Lutheran schools to-day, although these children pass by a stately public school four times a day on their way to and from school.

Then there are unchurchly West End people who would prefer to have their children brought up to their own views, and who could well afford to support schools of their own color. And if they could, why should the community be taxed to give them what they can provide for themselves to suit themselves?

And yet there would be room for purely secular public schools in our country. In many places and districts the various churches are so thinly represented that they cannot maintain schools of their own. Many parents are unwilling to commit their children to religious schools and unwilling or unable to establish and maintain non-religious schools. There let the State step in and provide and amply provide schools and teachers for those children who would otherwise grow up with little or no schooling of any kind, schools open and available to all, Jews and Gentiles, schools as purely secular as the State is purely secular. Of course, these schools would be few and small compared with what our public schools are now. Most of the children of the churches would never set foot into one of them. All the churches would be stronger, stronger in quantity, stronger in quality. Few people would think of putting their children where they do not belong, and few people would think of putting the Bible where it does not belong.

We expect to see the waters of the Chicago River turned back once more to pour into Lake Michigan several years before we shall see the masses of Christian children in America gathered in Christian schools. But no matter what we St. Louis people may do to invert the current of that sluggish stream, it will take us quite a while to bring about the change. And whatever we "Missouri" people may say or do, it will take us still longer to bring about the reflux of those millions of children from where they do not belong to where they should properly be. We are pretty sure that this educational problem is a hopeless case; that

the only treatment which would lead to a cure will never be attempted on a larger scale, and that all the palliatives administered will leave the patient a hopeless invalid.

The palliative which was until recently printed in bold type in the educational *Materia Medica* was the Sunday School. But the puny looks of the children under treatment spoke louder than all the praises of that nostrum; and all the apparatus of Lesson Leaves and cards and Sunday School papers and pictorial charts and diagrams and conventions *et cetera* could not prevent this institution from sinking into discredit in the estimation of many who had eyes to see and ears to hear. People are losing faith in these dosings with soothing syrup and paregoric, which may be very good in their place, but cannot cure a disease which requires heroic treatment with a sovereign remedy. Said Professor Sylvester Burnham, of Hamilton Theological Seminary, in a recent letter: "I certainly hope that something may be done to better the present Sunday-school work. I am more and more impressed that it is accomplishing very little in the matter of imparting any real or useful knowledge of biblical teachings, either from the intellectual or spiritual point of view." And Professor W. N. Clarke, of Colgate University: "The unwillingness of the National Sunday School Convention at Denver to adopt reasonable improvements in method opens the way to other agencies and seems to render them necessary."

And now the palliative in which all the hopes of many are centered is *the Bible in the public schools*. What the children need is religious training. What they are now to get is three or five minutes of Bible reading a day. What the children need is sufficient food not only to keep them alive, but also to secure a steady and healthy growth. What they are to get is an allowance of a spoonful of milk a day. This is even worse than the Sunday School, which affords

about an hour a week, where this would not make it half that time. But even if the allowance were ten minutes a day, that would not constitute religious training. You cannot bring up a healthy child even on three spoons of milk a day; nor a sick one either.

The trouble with many who are now clamoring for the Bible in the public schools is that they have not received proper Christian training themselves and do not know what Christianity is. If Christianity were the religion of the Golden Rule, three minutes of Bible reading a day might be amply sufficient not only to inculcate the sum and substance of Christianity, but also to teach the children that the religion of the Bible is not Golden Rule Christianity at all. To make the Golden Rule, or the Law, the fundamental doctrine of religion for fallen man is not Christianity, but heathendom; and that cannot be learned from the Bible, though it be read ten hours a day instead of ten minutes.

Some of the Doctors who have expressed their sympathy with the new movement for religious education would be ready at once to sacrifice the Christian character of the religious training contemplated. A prominent Congregationalist, Dr. Josiah Strong, wrote some months ago: "There is a profound need of a great ethical revival in the church as well as outside of it, and a much better ethical training should be given both in the Sunday school and the day school. I am of the number who believe that religion affords the only adequate basis for ethical instruction.... Between the upper and nether millstones of Romanism and secularism, all religion will be ground out of our public schools. I would like very much to see inculcated in them the fundamental truths common to all monotheistic religions, namely, the existence of a God, man's immortality, and his accountability. Jew, Catholic, and Protestant alike believe in these fundamental truths." We must say, this

is putting rather a low estimate upon young America. If some one were to say, "Our schools are in need of a great intellectual revival; I would like to see at least addition and subtraction taught in them," this would be quite a compliment compared with what the Doctor has to say of the children in our public schools. For if inculcating "the existence of a God, man's immortality, and his accountability," is to be the coming ideal basis for "far better ethical training" than these children are now enjoying, in what Egyptian darkness of profound moral and religious ignorance must they be groping about until the great ethical revival shall have come!

A. G.

Theological Review.

Little Lambs. *A series of Leaflets for the little ones, corresponding to the lessons in our Bible History for Parochial and Sunday Schools. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.*

Terms: 10 copies of any number or variety of numbers, 15 cts.; 25 copies, 30 cts.; 50 copies, 50 cts.; 100 copies, \$1.00. Sample copy free.

This is an exquisite juvenile publication, excellent in plan and execution. Each number of four octavo pages contains a full page picture on the first page, a story from the Bible History with illustration and a Golden Text on the second page, a series of Questions on the same story, on the third page, and a reading lesson referring to the picture on page 1 covering the fourth page, all in large, clean type, the whole leaflet a thing of beauty and of enduring value. The Easter story opens the series, and the continuation follows the order of the Lessons in our *Bible History*. These are without exception the best and finest Sunday School Lesson Leaves we have seen; they may also do excellent service in the parochial school.

A. G.